T|SOR|31|2|2

"The Word" Library—No. 2.

THE REBEL- AND HIS DISCIPLES

By

GUY A. ALDRED

Price - 4d.

1940.
GLASGOW:
The Strickland Press, 104 George St., C.1.
Bakunin Press, Bakunin Hall, 29 Castle St., C.3.

CONTENTS

PAGE

Forewords 3

Main body of work consists of 11 Chapters, which carry no titles. These relate the birth of Jesus and the early developments of Christian thought and dogma 5-36

APPENDICES.

I.—The Bethlehem Birth 37

II.—Jesus: His Mental Growth 38

III.—The Church and War 40

IV.—The Marian Martyrs 43

Author's Note 49

THE REBEL—AND HIS DISCIPLES

(First published in 1912 as *The Rebel—And His Disciples* in *The Revolt Library—No.* 1. Issued from 17 Richmond Gardens, Shepherd's Bush, London, W. Revised chapters re-arranged, re-written slightly and re-published, 1920, in *Spur, Glasgow Library—No.* 1, under title *Communism and Religion.* Issued by Bakunin Press from Richmond Gardens and Bakunin House, 13 Burnbank Gardens, Glasgow.)

The original title page explained: "A Study in Christian Origins, showing that the passage from Calvary to the Capitol is through Kerioth." That is, the land of Judas.

AUTHOR'S FOREWORDS.

In re-issuing this pamphlet, we have decided to return to the original title. The phrase then used accurately expresses the author's matured attitude. Christians must choose between Jesus and the Church, between Jesus and organised pseudo-Christian society, between Jesus and capitalism, between Jesus and war.

Glasgow, April 4th, 1940. G. A. A.

FOOTNOTE TO *COMMUNISM AND RELIGION.*

This pamphlet has been revised and re-written from *The Rebel and His Disciples,* published in March, 1912. Those who wish for a clear understanding of the conditions under which Jesus made his propaganda will find it not so much in Britain as in the circumstances of revolt that exist under the British Despotism in India.

Glasgow, 1920.

FROM "TO OUR READERS."

Before our pious opponents proceed to reply to this brochure, we should be very pleased if they would take the pains to make quite sure of their reverence for the Rebel-Tramp of Nazareth and thus save us the trouble of having to point out that their abuse of our work is but the rage of the Apostates. For our part, we shall dismiss as Pharisees all who want us to pay tribute to Christ as a god whilst reverencing clerics who pray for the king and powers that be. Such disgusting hypocrites merit scorn but not argument, and we shall give them their deserts.

London, March 26th, 1912.

The Rebel—And His Disciples

I.

THERE was nothing remarkable about the birth of Jesus. There rarely is about the birth of any truly great man. There was nothing miraculous about it. How could there be? There was nothing illegitimate about it even. He was not as much as a love-child. And yet his name and fame have passed into the mythic lore of history. His memory is immortal. His worth as a man, and the worth of his trade as an agitator, have fired the poetic imagination of mankind. And so men speak of his birth as a wonderful event, even deem it a miraculous one, and view it as something illegitimate. Thus does our hero-worship express at once the grandeur and squalor of our souls.

Jesus was not descended from David. Vainly do we pretend to discover kings in his lineage. He was but a carpenter, the son of a carpenter. He came of a line of toilers. As honourable a descent surely as that from a line of kings? He was not even born in the royal city of Bethlehem. Other carpenters may have been, but not the carpenter called Jesus of Nazareth. Nature despised royalty too much to conceive her prophet in the city of kings.

Jesus was born in Nazareth of Galilee, of non-Jewish parents, between B.C. 8 and B.C. 4. He was the *legitimate* son of Joseph and Mary. His parents were poor but honest—as the bourgeoisie say. But their poverty was not distinctive. It did not permit him to be born in a manger. Instead, he was conceived in an ordinary working-class home of the place and period.

The event had no disturbing influence on the course of nature. No stars wandered from their place in the firmament to act as guides to wise men from the East. Wise men know that the child is father to the man. But until they know the man they cannot salute the child for being the proper father to the rightful man; and straying stars do not help them any.

So no wise men visited his cradle. Whenever have wise men visited a great man's cradle — except when he was dead and the cradle was decayed? Rather have the wise men gathered round the death-bed and blasphemed as the last spark of life left the great one's body; or they have rallied to the funeral pyre and lit the faggots that consumed the body in a vain effort to quench the spirit. Wise men respect the great when the great are dead. The living great they do not understand nor know. They scorned Jesus in the maturity of his greatness. How could they appreciate him in his infancy?

No one suspected the infant Jesus of being a future liberator. His birth occasioned no despair to Herod. It led to no massacre of the innocents. Herod was probably as great an assassin as any Imperial puppet of the Roman Despotism. But he had no means of learning that a prophet was coming into existence. He did not slay children indiscriminately in a vain effort to prevent a freeman from being born. Tyrants by slaughter can never prevent the avenger from arising. The son of man, with his call to liberty and action, comes like a thief in the night, no one knows when or how. The oppressor is as ignorant of his coming as the oppressed—until he arrives. Then it is too late to undo his work. Nature, in its yearning for liberty, deprives rulers of the power to calculate the time, place, and the circumstances of his birth. The finest police system in the universe could not discover the address of his parents or the hour of his arrival.

Jesus was only a man. He could be nothing more. Nature produces no higher kind of being; but it may produce a very high type of man. Jesus was one of its very high type. He had two sisters and four brothers; but they paid scant attention to his mental and moral height. They regarded his genius as a form of madness. They did not appreciate him for being a seer. To them he was an unknown quantity, and when he was responding most earnestly to the need of his age, they thought he was shirking his duty as a maker of tables. He abandoned himself with a generous impulsiveness to the cause of social revolt and individual regeneration. They responded with a no less hearty impulsiveness to the cause of family obligation and individual denunciation. They abused him for being beside himself when he exposed the rottenness of priestcraft, and impeached it as being but the shadow of righteousness. They declaimed loudly against him because he dared to stand for the substance. Their shame was complete when a corrupt governing class crucified him as a matter of course! Oh! why did he do it! Why did he live for eternity instead of time! Why did he wound his family pride in order to heal humanity's sores! The iniquity of his conduct appalled them! How natural it all was! Were they to know that this vagabond son and brother was destined to live in history as the great prophet of the new period of internationalism? Would you have known it, had he been your brother? Of course not. Then do not condemn the brethren of Jesus for not suspecting him of being a god. Examine your own life and learn why they refused to pay homage to him as such. Then you will understand why, when he grew up and went about preaching, they sought to restrain him by force, and blushed at the disgrace he put upon them. And you will know that there was nothing divine, but something very human, very tragic, and very great because so human and tragic, about the career of Jesus of Nazareth. You will know, beyond the power of priest and minister to convince you otherwise, that there was nothing marvellous nor miraculous about his career.

This suggestion was invented by men who never understood the greatness of the man. In proportion, as you realise he was not a god, you will discover that he is not a myth. Thought and experience will reveal him to you as a great living personality, a vital human being, sentenced, like you and I, to a short span of life followed by an eternal sleep.

II.

Jesus owes his immortality as the great apostle of the new era of internationalism to his social position and the condition of the world at the time in which he lived. Poverty destined his place in history and zeal for power, reduced his manhood and worth to myth and superstition. Although racially non-Jewish, he was the last embodiment of the Jewish spirit of prophetic righteousness. His habits of thought were distinctly Jewish. Like the seers of Israel who had predeceased him, he had no patience with ritual, ceremonies, or sacred days. He was inspired with magnificent scorn for the spiritual uncleanliness of priestly pretence. He knew nothing of divinely ordained ritual and verbally inspired books. He knew nought of the miraculous. He was probably a theomaniac. But he identified his god with the righteousness of liberty, the defence of the harlot, the protection of the outcast. He saw through the lying shams of political success, because he identified himself with a race whose history had been one of misfortune. He shared with his compatriot, Judas the Gaulonite, the credit of declaring it was wrong to call any man master. His was the spirit of rebellion. Yet he came of a section of the population whose very slavishness accounted for Jesus, the alien, catching the spirit of righteousness that had formerly inspired the seers of Israel.

For a century and a half before the birth of Jesus no Jew had resided in Nazareth. But for nearly a century its racially Gentile population had embraced Judaism, practised circumcision, and subscribed to the Mosaic law. During a rare moment of Jewish ascendency, they had suffered not only a political, but also a social conquest. Consequently, their whole outlook became Jewish with the lapse of generations. Galilee developed into the home of revolt, largely because of Roman ignorance of this fact.

The Roman despotism appeared in Judea in B.C. 63, but it did not establish itself there until 26 years later. It then concluded a campaign of massacre and pillage by dedicating a crown of gold to God in honour of its victory. From this time onward, Jehovah, like Jupiter and Apollo, became subject to the Roman Emperor. Jerusalem became the centre of festivals held in his honour. The Pharisees and chief priests were his interested representatives.

Sacrifices were regularly offered to God "in behalf of him and the Roman Empire." The Temple at Jerusalem became a Roman fortress, the barracks of alien murderers. The Lake of Galilee became the Lake of Tiberias, and the Jewish town of Capernaum became a Roman capital under the name of Tiberias. Bethsaida was converted into Julias, so named in honour of a Roman Empress. Everywhere Jewish race conservatism was assaulted, and Galilee was specially chosen for its "Gentile" sites, on which temples were erected to Augustus.

This policy reacted on Jewish idealism. Hitherto, Jewish Anarchs, if they attacked the Sanhedrin, found themselves victimised by the clamour of national superstition. Priestcraft represented their demands as so many aspects of "sin" against God—a revolt against his covenant. The voicing of economic discontent was a crime against God himself; and all the superstition of the oppressed was aroused against "the blasphemer." Now things were different. Roman Imperialism revelled in ceremonial. Judaism was opposed to all idolatry of the visible. Its pet superstition was the invisible that had been the visible. The ostentatious ritual of the Pharisees were not sufficient to bridge this gulf. It only added zest to the resentment of the people. So the High Priests and Pharisees were impeached for violating God's sovereignty. The oppressed people's cry for liberty never went beyond the boundaries of superstition. It dragged the Anarchs down to their level of expression. To successfully attack the priestcraft of the Sanhedrin they had to conform to the limitations of the prevailing superstition that had inspired the revolt. The outcast discovered discontent to be a pious obligation. It was a defence of God's covenant against the Roman Emperor cult—*the Synagogue of Satan*; a poverty-stricken patriotism contending against the power of the Gentile and Jewish plutocracies. Satan's immediate agents in Judea were the under-paid tax-gatherers who were employed by the Pharisees of the Esquestrian Order. Their treachery constituted a "sin" against God and a betrayal of his covenant. They could repent, but they could never be converted, since they had already "known God." It was a question of moral goodwill as opposed to intellectual light. Traitors to any movement may be brought to repentance where they have neither the need nor the possibility of being converted.

It is different with opponents who are ignorant. They can only be "won over" by argument and persuasion; by having the devils of darkness and ignorance cast out of them by conversion. Such can *never* sin against God, can *never* betray him, since *they have never known him.* They may have persecuted him, to be sure; but it was in the ignorance of unbelief. Many Gentiles were in this position. The Rome despotism discovered them in rebellion. They loved the cause of liberty. By the cries of the Jewish oppressed they had been brought to live in the light, where they had formerly dwelt in

the outer darkness. Their "conversion" restored the balance of Jewish hope. It compensated for Jewish "sin." Such were the conceptions of these terms current in Judea many years before the time of Jesus. It was impossible for him, as an Anarch, to do other than embrace them.

This fact offers the cue to the materialistic basis of Christian origins. It reveals the necessary limitations of Jesus's work. Without detracting from his sincerity it seriously militates against his classification as a leader whose words can supply us with the key to modern Capitalist developments. And then it shows how he came to spread a propaganda of revolt that demanded *not* material liberty as economic reality desirable in itself, but social liberty in the terms of a Jewish national superstition of Godliness! True, Jesus was not limited by national considerations! True, also, his propaganda was a vital propaganda alive with the spirit of righteousness, permeated with a hatred of cant! But limited always by the terms in which it was expressed—always conditioned by the idolatry of the God-idea—that baneful superstition that gave birth to ecclesiastical Rome, founded on the ruins of political Paganim.

Yet this much must be said for Jesus. When the superstition of Godliness has been forgotten, the record of his genius, the sincerity of his propaganda, the passion of his vigorous devotion to liberty, will still be remembered as an inspirational legacy from the past. That can never die so long as mankind lives. The curse that he placed upon Capernaum! The impossibilist belief in no compromise between God and Mammon, between righteousness and Satan! The impeachment of priestcraft! The proletarian negation of Sabbatarianism! These records will live and be appreciated by all who scorn the traitor Josephus and hate the parasitism of affected culture!

Bacon has eulogised the times of Augustus Caesar as civil times on account of their Atheism. We cannot applaud his taste. Owing to the wisdom of the ministers of Augustus, Pharisees became members of the Roman Equestrian Order and farmers of the taxes collected from Judea. Special places were reserved for them in the theatres and public assemblies. Taxes placed on widows and married people without children, secured to them money grants and assured State incomes. In return they upheld the Roman despotism and acclaimed its every suppression of righteousness. And what a despotism it was! Any offences against the Imperial dignity—even the speaking of a few words—were visited with immediate death. It was a moral obligation to beat a slave; but it became a high treason to beat him near a statue of Augustus. Spies flourished on every hand. Rewards were voted for persecutors and witnesses. Abstract religious belief was tolerated only in so far as it did not militate against the cult of the Emperor. When it invaded this counter-idolatry it became a blasphemy against his political

supremacy. Thus vital religious belief was not persecuted as a religious heresy, because it was murdered as a political crime. Not least among those who challenged this unrighteous despotism were Judas the Gaulonite or Galilean, his heroic sons, and his no less heroic grandson, Eleazar. Judas flourished during the boyhood of Jesus, and his sons were crucified for rebellion some years after the latter's martyrdom. Eleazor, the grandson, fell fighting at Jerusalem in the famous Jewish revolt of A.D. 66-70. He was one of the band of patriots who declined to acknowledge the Roman Emperor as the Messiah. They repudiated the Pharisaical notion that God chastised the Jews by alien domination. The leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod they scorned. Roman garrisons were massacred. Gifts were refused for the Temple from foreigners. All sacrifices were rejected both on behalf of the Emperor and the people of Rome generally. The heathen monuments or stones, intended for the receipt of these votive offerings, were cast down. In seizing upon the donations of the aliens, John of Gisgala, the leader of the patriots, declared that those who were fighting for the Temple might live by the Temple. He accordingly caused to be melted down the wine-goblets presented by Augustus and his consort.

Jesus had anticipated some such revolt as this. We adopt a correct translation of Luke xxi., 5-6 :—

> "And as some spake of the outer temple, how it was adorned with goodly stones and votive gifts, he said: 'As for these things, the days will come in which there shall not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down.' "

Not only were the rebels finally defeated and Jerusalem laid low in A.D. 70, but a second revolt in A.D. 135 resulted in the second Roman destruction of Jerusalem. This event extinguished all Jewish hopes of successful revolt without reconciling the common people to the Pharisees and the Sanhedrin. But the spirit of revolt was there, and led to persons uniting together in Christian congregations. Persecutions followed. The disciples of Jesus were indicted for blasphemy and impiety. They were charged with ignoring or scorning the public festivals and declining to offer religious rites before the Emperor's statue. They proclaimed the *one-ness* of the universe and of humanity, and refused all service and tribute to militarism and Imperialism. Their indifference to suffering and their menace to the established political power became proverbial.

III.

Down to the third century Christians everywhere taught and acted upon the belief that Jesus was inspired by the *Christ-Spirit.* This spirit was not born but was eternal. It was forever manifesting itself in the lives of the great and good. It was a *God*—i.e., a dominating force or influence—unknown to the world—and good on that account. It was the word of truth and freedom making itself known through the medium of the oppressed and humble, and it was opposed to another God—the God of the world, an evil-intentioned deity who was mighty but not righteous. He upheld thrones, and was believed in by the Jews as the deity of the law and prophets.

Actually, he was a dead and lying deity. He inspired the priestly fraud and pious invention of the Pentateuch. He was the deity of the Old Testament. On this account the Christians rejected the Old Testament as *not* being inspired. This deity of darkness and authority inspired the Apostle Paul. Hence the Christians knew him as an apostle and deceiver. He gave up persecuting Christianity in order to betray it. Once he pursued it in the name of kings and rulers. Afterwards he taught, as its gospel, subservience to these same magistrates, and reconciled its "good news" with the toleration of slavery. He identified the worship of God with the honouring of the Emperor. He was a Pagan-Christian apologist for Paganism, and a believer in the degradation of woman. He hailed from Tarsus, the university home of Roman Stoicism; and, from his "upper class" sympathies, was more of a Stoic than a Christian.

In most cases the Christians were members of the producing class or the oppressed of despotism. The Pagan world regarded them as the illiterate and the rustic, the abandoned and the criminal. Actually, they were tailors, weavers, fullers, slaves, women, and boys. All of them admired Jesus the rebel, and loved the greatness of his personality. They sought to do justice to his teaching and to promote his message. That message appealed to them, not merely because of the heroism with which he expounded it, but also because it defined their class interest and the nature of their opposition to the ruling class. Thus they united upon the following items of doctrine in addition to those already defined.

(1) Oath-making was wrong and sinful.

(2) There was no resurrection from the dead.

(3) Laws were not necessary to bind human society together.

(4) Commnism was the only equitable state of society.

(5) Free Love was the right principle of sex-relationship.

Besides advocating these principles, many Christians adopted an ascetic life and abstained from meat eating.

Pagan philosophers, in their role of political panderers to the Emperor, complained bitterly of the obstinacy of these Christians. It was said to be easier to write on water than to persuade a Christian to give up his discipleship of Jesus. Since it was impossible to reclaim them, the liberals among the Imperial politicians suggested that these proletarian fanatics be left in their "folly, to hymn, in a faint mournful voice, the dead God, who publicly suffered death from judges of singular wisdom."

From this it will be seen that the term "God" was not used at this time in its modern theological sense. The Roman philosophers acknowledged Jesus to be a leader, a person who had attached followers to his name and memory. He was *a dead or mortal God.* True, they upbraided his disciples for "reckoning him who had a mortal body to be a God; and regarding themselves as pious on that account." But this was only the philosophic way of perpetuating religious superstition as an instrument of governing class despotism. They had no regard for Pagan polytheism, but they held that Imperial luxury was desirable. They accordingly worshipped the Roman Emperor as a God *in public* for the edification of the common people, and they pretended that he had an *im*mortal body. Their complaint against the Christians was an indictment of the latter's treason in refusing to recognise the Emperor's Godliness and immortality, and discovering true greatness in a penniless traveller all over Palestine, a wanderer with nowhere to lay his head, a propagandist of revolt, who died as a malefactor.

The Pagan philosophers claimed for the Emperor that he was God, the Son of God, Lord of the Universe. The Christians claimed for Jesus that he was a Man, the Son of Man, the Equal of the Emperor. When taxed to proclaim their faith they averred that Jesus was as much God, the Son of God, as the Emperor. Only later was this qualified challenge and bold truthful retort to Roman despotism translated into a lying article of a false and degrading faith.

As asserted by the early Christians, it roused the resentment of the Roman despotism because it was a message of spiritual health. It was the battle cry of the proletariat. It repudiated the Pagan letter of learning and Pagan conception of organisation. It was a reaction against the veneer of culture, and a declaration for the material values of righteousness. It implied that the people, and not the parasites mattered. It demanded social sincerity, good faith accompanied by sound works. It was the watchword of people who met together on the principle of open discussion in antagonism to the snobbery of their time.

Pagan notions began to give way before the advance of their vital propaganda. Inability to defend Paganism did not mean the posses-

sion of a mentality capable of grasping Christian teachings, however. Consequently, the letter spread where the spirit remained confined. Profession without possession became the order of the day. To increase the confusion, Rome began to appreciate the influence of the Nazarene rebel's name, and was willing to bestow the freedom of the city on him. It was intended to make his name subservient to the interests of the Roman Imperialism. Pagan-Christian factions now sprang up that boasted only the Christian name in common. Men of the world, ambitious of power, joined the Christian communities. Christianity was a living gospel that offered them the lever with which to blackmail the Roman Rulers, if only they could introduce the Pagan notion of organisation, representation, and delegated authority. This meant power, and could lead to only one end: *the conquest of political power by the church.*

IV.

Pagan-Christianity was born towards the end of the second century consequent upon the lost caste of the Jewish Priesthood and the political failure of Pagan Polytheism. Social conditions promised both honour and profit to all who should qualify as members of the new sacerdotal order of Pagan-Christian ministers. The demand, coupled with the possibility of rich rewards, created the supply; pastors of some of the larger Christian churches began to assume the character, titles, and rights of the Jewish Priesthood, or "God's special clergy." Memorable distinctions were now introduced between the laity and the clergy. Ecclesiastical government was inaugurated, and those who exercised supreme authority enjoyed the high and lofty title of Bishops. The latter were promoted from among the presbyters, who corresponded to the high priests among the Jews. They, in their turn, were selected from the deacons, who corresponded to the Levites. To calumniate any of these orders of the priesthood was an unpardonable crime.

Not content, however, with investing themselves with these ranks and characters, the bishops and pastors of the new order of Pagan-Christian Churches, in order to arouse the interest and attract the support of Pagan multitudes, introduced into the services of the church a Pagan ceremonial, in the same way as the modern minister discusses football at the Pleasant Sunday Afternoons—for men only! The Roman Church now enjoined the continuation of the Pagan custom of Easter observance and anathematised the Asiatic Christian communities that objected to this innovation. Mysteries were introduced into the Church Ritual; and there were attached to the Sacraments—the Latin name for mysteries—the hidden meaning and the peculiar virtues which was the custom among the Pagan priests.

The Pagan Church also lit up candles to God on its altars as if to insinuate that the Author and Giver of Light lived in the dark. The Pagan-Christian Church continued the custom. Christ certainly did not counsel his disciples to pursue this practice. He never dreamt of founding an ecclesiastical hierarchy. It was the latter that perpetuated Pagan ceremonial.

Similarly, the Pagan Church employed boys to assist the priest by swinging a censor containing rich incense which, smoking, breathed odours around her altars. The Pagan-Christian Church continued this practice also.

Overjoyed at the success of these measures, the aspiring clergy now instituted tithes, first fruits, and other circumstances of distinguishing external grandeur. Among the Jewish populace the Mosaic law had fallen into contempt. Jesus had declared that his purpose had been to abolish it; and *the* Christians had maintained his purpose. But the Pagan-Christian clergy now attributed to him their forged dictum that he came not to destroy, but to fulfil the law. Christ never uttered this statement. It was the invention of a clergy anxious to diligently inculcate the article of the Mosaic law relevant to tithes and to maintain the belief that this offering was a divine obligation.

Similarly, utterances were forged in the name of Christ, committing the keys of hell and paradise to ecclesiastical governors. Pagan customs were continued by the pretended authority of their laws and decrees.

Priestly power was augmented by meetings of delegation of bishops in council held to discuss questions relative to their doctrines and mutual defence. *All who subscribed to the original Christian teachings were denied admission to these congresses.*

The necessity of centralised power and discipline, and duty of excommunication, were insisted upon. The battering engine of temporal power involved social outlawry and starvation.

"Pious frauds" and "false miracles" were freely practised. The credulity of the people was fostered, and license was now extended to ecclesiastical forgery. Great numbers of books were written with no other view than to deceive the simple-minded multitude—who, at this time, formed the great bulk of the Christian communities—into embracing the idea of the Pagan-Christian Church. The "Apostle" Paul had come under the influence of Stoical philosophy. He imbibed the ethical principles that were an integral portion of the whole philosophic system of Stoicism. The Church pretended otherwise. So it composed a spurious "correspondence" between Paul and his Stoic contemporary, L. Annæus Seneca, "proving" that the Stoics had borrowed from the Christians! This sort of stupid lying was counted piety. Presbyters and deacons

everywhere held that it was their business to deceive; and that deception was deserving of commendation rather than of censure. In a word it was avowed that to deceive persons into embracing the doctrines of the Church was so valuable a service as to hallow deceit itself.

The consequence of this Pagan-swamping of the Christian communities became obvious in the third century, when Pagan practices and pious forgery were publicly approved and openly defended. The books of the heresiarchs, or true Christians, were now destroyed; and we are henceforth obliged to rely on the writings of orthodox Pagan-Christian corruptionists. The excommunication of heresiarchs now gave way to the denunciations of schismatics, to the wrangling of men devoid of principle as to who should rule. Ofttimes, schism verged on heresy; but schism now became the principal offence.

The early Christians had openly denounced the Roman Despotism. The Pagan-Christian Church merely suspended its allegiance. It declined to worship the Emperor, but was willing to perpetuate his power on his acknowledging the supremacy of the Church. It became increasingly necessary to deny the manhood of the seditionist of Nazareth and to assert his godhead. The Church acted accordingly. With the lapse of time it ceased to regard the historic Jesus. Its mystics spoke of an ideal "Christ" that dwelt in every man. It gave up the idealism of earth for the idealism of heaven. It identified its earthly career with centuries of the most brutal and bloody materialism.

In this way it abolished the spirit of permanent revolt and social purity. It was now possible to claim, first, equality with, and later supremacy over, the State for the Church. Ambitious prelates were no longer required to praise a carpenter at the expense of the Emperor. All that was vital in the Christian traditions was now rendered subservient to the desolating pestilence of an usurped authority trading on popular credulity. The Church was intent on becoming the greatest blight the world had ever known. It was doomed to wage, by its perpetuation of ignorance, one of the cruellest wars against the genius of knowledge and liberty the world had even seen.

V.

The epic story of the life of Jesus became merged in the Christ legend at the beginning of the third century. By the end of the sixth century the transformation was complete. A little of the original story was preserved. But very little. To it was added records of marvels formerly attributed to the Pagan Gods, but now

ascribed to Christ in order to emphasise the fact that the Christian Church had succeeded in conquering from the Pagan Church supreme political authority. The biographical details were considered to be not matters of fact, but titles of office. This is evident from a careful study of the growth of the Christ legend in relation to the actual economic and political needs of the Church as it moved from outlawry to respectability. The simple witness of Calvary becomes obscured in Judas-like calculations in the land of Kerioth. The Church is born again in the spirit of Judas, and with worldly subtlety marches on to the conquest of the Capitol. Outwardly, it remains the Church of Jesus. Inwardly, it is a Pagan Ecclesia. Finally, the sham becomes too great to maintain, and it boldly avows its hypocrisy and counts its pretensions righteousness.

The complete Christ legend is contradictory and absurd. Yet every item in that record was invented with a purpose and to answer a pressing need.

First of all the term "Christ" itself hardened. The early Church, and the heresiarchs, who continued its traditions, maintained only that Jesus was inspired by the *Christ-Spirit.* They never claimed that he was *the Christ.* But the rising, conquering, ambitious Church of the third century could not afford to restrict its authority and divide its power. So it boldly claimed that Jesus was *the* Christ, and that the Church, through its ministers, had conserved his message. From this time onwards Christ becomes the surname of Jesus. And though we, irrespective of whether we know better or not, continue this historical fallacy, it should be borne in mind that Jesus himself would never have answered to the surname of Christ. In continuing to call him by this name we are pandering really to the fraudulent pretensions of the Church.

The story of the descent from David and the remarkable genealogies, followed the manufacture of the surname "Christ." It was inevitable that the Church should discover Jesus to be descended from the Jewish king after the fall of Jerusalem and the collapse of the Sanhedrin. The Jews sighed for a Messiah, a deliverer from the Roman Despotism. But they were race-proud and boasted of their father, Abraham. They rejected Jesus as a Messiah because of his Gentile birth. They looked upon him as no true Jew, repudiated him as a child born of fornication. In order to supersede the fallen Jewish Church, and to establish its claim to authority over the Jews, the Christian Church declared Jesus to be *not* the Son of Man, but the Son of David. He was translated into the Jewish Messiah because the Church wanted power and authority as the new Jewish Church.

But the pretence was incomplete without the story of Herod's massacre of the innocents. This invention was the next addition to the incidents of the Christ legend. This was necessary in order

to explain away the record of Christ's crucifixion by the Roman authorities. It reconciled the Church to the Empire by denying the seditious character of Christ's career. Jesus was said to have been sent by God to challenge the ritual of the Pharisees and to reveal a new theology. He was denied his historic place as a social revolutionist and political reconstructionist. Instead it was pretended that he was to extend the domination of the Jewish God, and found a cosmopolitan Church. The new Church had power to interpret the Mosaic Law and the Old Testament. This was its explanation of Jesus's very human objection to the authority of both. By this means it destroyed the right of private judgment, proclaimed by Jesus, and established clerical authority. The plea drew a definite distinction between the position of the clergy and the laity in the Church's councils.

Pagan ritual and sacraments were introduced. At Rome, and wherever the power of the Roman section of the Church was acknowledged, the Pagan custom of Easter observance and rejoicing became part and parcel of the Church's sacrament. And the epic story of the agitator's career was replaced by a more and more wonderful mosaic of myth and superstition collected from all climes and ages. Wherever the Church went it fastened on to the love of the local gods, and changed the hero's name to Jesus. For it was concerned not with truth, but with the conquest of political power. Its Jesus was a myth—a marvellous sign which changed its colour and varied its significance to suit all needs and tastes. It became all things to all men. It was used as the mascot to power. The growth in fantasy of the Christ legend measured the increasing hypocrisy of the Church.

VI.

From the conversion of Constantine the Christ legend assumes a more and more definite heavenly character. It leaves the earth entirely, and becomes nothing but a divine bastardy. The record of its growth is to be found in the decisions of the Church Councils, and the writings of the Church forgers. The date of each invention is written in the pages of history for all to read:

A.D. 325. — (1) *Constantine establishes Sunday as a Holy Day.* One of the outstanding commands of the Old Testament is the observance of the Sabbath. The laws governing its observance are laid down with the strictest solemnity in the Pentateuch. Nevertheless the Sabbath was not observed as an express Divine Institution until eight centuries after the time of Moses, who is the traditional author of the Pentateuch. This brings the authorship of the differing versions of the commandments of Sinai down to the

time of the Babylonish captivity. Before this event, the observance of the Sabbath is merely placed on a level with that of the New Moon. Like the latter, Sabbath observance took its origin from an astronomical phenomenon that offered itself to the simplest planetary observation of various members of the Jewish tribes. It was bound up with the idea of a seven-day week. This is, apparently, the equivalent of the time which it takes the Moon to pass from one of her chief phases to another. In reality, the period is a little over seven days. The Moon passes through a complete cycle of four phases in four such periods—i.e., a month. From their common observance of these facts seems to have originated the seven-day week among the numerous nations and tribes of the earth that adopted it, often without any possibility of intercourse or borrowing.

As the Jewish Sabbath had a frankly lunar, so did the Pagan Sunday have a frankly solar origin. The observance of either day had nothing to do with Christianity. It was merely a matter of geography. As the Christian Church extended the area of its influence, it enlarged the domain over which the Jewish Sabbath was observed. Many sections of the Christian Church continued its observance as a matter of tradition. Such was the case for centuries with the Nestorian Church situate in the mountains of Armenia.

Wherever the Christian religion established itself as a prophetic-heterodox Judaism among the Jews, Saturday remained its favourite day of assembling. Where its centre was cosmopolitan—its converts, Pagans as well as Jews—Saturday and Sunday were equal favourites. As early as the second century, it was a common practice for Christians to assemble on the Sabbath as well as on the Day of the Sun. Sunday was only the one day of meeting where the Christian converts were Pagan only. The supercession of Saturday by Sunday as the one day of religious import to Christians was a matter of natural evolution. When the Church became established the change was inevitable. It was demanded by the Roman Imperialism as an atonement to the Paganism it had repudiated as no longer serving its ends. Though crushed and politically cast out, this Paganism still existed and threatened vengeance. It had its zealots who declined to worship at altars dedicated to strange gods. Sunday observance was ordained in order to placate the feelings of this menacing, obsolete orthodoxy. It was also an expression of political contempt for the sacred day of the stiff-necked enemies of the Roman Imperialism of the Jews. The race was honoured by hatred, because the prophets and seers of Israel—as opposed to its priests—in the midst of worldly wisdom and the idolatry of power, were always voicing the call of righteousness, always speaking with inspiration of the perfect law of liberty. And they found the last of their race in Jesus. The grand, foolish tramp of Nazareth first acted upon the idea—and then publicly avowed—that the Sabbath

was made for man, not man for the Sabbath. He gave historical precedent for placing Sabbath observance merely in the category of custom and tradition. But he certainly never intended that his disciples should repudiate the Jewish Sabbath, only to establish a superstitious regard for the Pagan Sunday. Jesus would have ridiculed such an idea. He would have done on the "Christian" Sunday what he did on the Jewish Sabbath. His role would have been that of a beggar and a thief. He would have justified the action of hunger by setting the right of property beneath his feet. He would have "blasphemed the Lord's day" as certainly as he did "the Sabbath." He would have defied the Church as he defied the State.

(2) *Belief in the Resurrection promulgated as an accompaniment to Sunday Observance.* In the post-mortem influence of Jesus the Church discovered a Resurrection. So it invented a foretype of that "Resurrection" to appease Pagan appetites for the festive and the mythological. This rehearsal of the mythical Resurrection of Christ is recorded in John xi. It is commonly referred to as the Resurrection of Lazarus. If carefully considered, this will be seen to be too theatrical to be true. But if it is considered as an allegorical portrayal of the decease of the old and the birth of the new year, all difficulty at once vanishes. Lazarus is perceived to be the old year; his sisters the months of December and January; and Jesus Christ the Sun. The Resurrection of Christ falls into the same category at that of Lazarus. It is a Sun-myth, a symbolical representation of the decease of the old and the birth of the new year. It was, and is, a perpetuation of Pagan mythology by a corrupted Church in the terms of a more popular phraseology. The inventors of this myth knew "the risen one," however, only as *Jesus of Nazareth, which was a prophet mighty in word and deed before God and all the people.* But this conception of a human Jesus was not to be held to for long.

(3) *The Godhead of Christ officially promulgated by* 318 *bishops in the presence of the Emperor Constantine.*

(4) *Divinity of the Holy Ghost affirmed by* 150 *bishops at Constantinople.* This was essential to the popular perversion of Christ's influence. Jesus had denounced the Pharisees and identified himself with the Publicians or tax-gatherers. He held that the latter were not necessarily opposed to National Independence, and that, at the right moment, they would decide for righteousness and liberty. But the Pharisees were different. At heart they were one with the Roman Despotism. They blasphemed against the holy spirit of the single-eyedness of purpose. Their offence was unpardonable. (Matt. xii., 31.) As the Church was now in the position of the Pharisees and the Sanhedrin, it had to convert Jesus's declaration into a lie, and invent a new God, the Holy Ghost. In his name it

increased its power. The story of Christ's Baptism was now invented.

A.D. 346-420.—St. Jerome flourishes. He highly disapproves of distinctions being drawn between bishops and priests, because St. Paul did not believe in such distinctions. He also repudiates the early teaching of *spiritual health,* and introduces the doctrine of *salvation.* This subtle, but vital, negation of primordial Christian teaching favoured purposes of ecclesiastical imposition. Idea of damnation first taught. Up to now, Christians had proclaimed at their meetings: "Believe, if ye would be healthy, or depart." Henceforth it was to be: "Believe, and be baptised, if ye would be saved; or be damned."

A.D. 431. — *Virgin Mary declared to be Mother of God.* Story of the Bethlehem Birth now invented to complement the supernatural character of the "risen Christ." This invention also served to emphasise the story of the Davidic descent—so essential to ecclesiastical interests—and to further explain away Christ's antagonism to the Jewish priesthood. The Church forgers failed to note the contradiction between this forgery and the earlier effort of the Davidic descent. It forgets that the earlier forgers knew nothing about either the miraculous birth or the Bethlehem manger-cradle. It was only concerned with the record that had come down from the first century, of how Jesus had gone into the Synagogue and taken his stand by the Prophet Isaiah, claiming to be the pioneer of freedom whose coming Isaiah had foretold. This was a perfectly legitimate application of the prophet's words. In order to explain away this record—the memory of which it could not destroy owing to the activity of the true Christians or heresiarchs — the Church seized on a passage in Isaiah relating to the prophet's own son, and invented the Virgin Birth story. It was killing several difficulties with one forgery.

A.D. 451.—*Jesus is officially declared to possess two natures, and to be both God and Man.* All who repudiate this notion are excommunicated. The Christian idea is now strangled, and monotheism and polytheism establish a political alliance. No further heed is given to the words of Jesus, when he said that he was not even a judge or divider, nor even a "Rabbi" over his disciples; when he said: "Call no man master."

A.D. 540.—*Death of Dionysius, the famous Ecclesiastical Forger.* He introduced the custom of counting the years from the birth of Jesus. Pagan-Christianity finally triumphs; and "heresy" gives way to schism. But it is not quite dead; only sleeping none too peaceably.

VII.

The Pagan Pantheon or Rotunda was originally dedicated by Agrippa to Jove and all the Gods. It was rededicated by Pope Boniface IV. to the Blessed Virgin and all the Saints. The difference was nominal. Instead of the "old" Gods having separate altars, it was the "new" saints who were thus honoured. And worshippers, instead of invoking the aid of favourite Gods, sought the assistance of Patron Saints.

The Pagan deities were the recipients of votive offerings. So were the Christian Saints. Parallelism could go no farther.

Altars dedicated to Bacchus or Iachus, the Pagan God of wine, bore the letters I.H.S. They signified the One of Fire, or Sun God. The Christian Church continued the use of the letters. It discovered that they meant Jesus Hominum Salvator—Jesus, the Saviour of Men! This, at the beginning of the Dark Ages, when the Christian Church was about to make the name of Christ synonymous with the extinction of classical knowledge and the suppression of thought.

Tribal man came into contact with forests as well as with sex distinctions and lunar divisions of time. Trees, birds, and beasts all existed to make their impressions upon him. Accidents often occurred in the course of this acquaintanceship. After he had discovered that he could ride on the back of five-toed horses, he would learn that a gallop through the forest would lead to being caught up in the branches of an overhanging tree, and subsequent death by strangulation. Such an accident would inevitably suggest a mode of exterminating enemies. The original gallows was unquestionably a tree branch. Its latter form was a cross. Crucifixion would naturally evolve—from man's race experience—into a form of hanging.

The crucifix-gallows was that upon which Christ died. Many have similarly died before him. Many have similarly died since his death. Liberty is for ever being born on the gallows.

The Pagan Imperialism that murdered Christ found the origin of its ceremonial and ecclesiastical ritual in Solarism. The latter was associated with Phallicism. It found its expression in "the sign of the cross." The cross was its sacred emblem.

Nothing daunted, the Christian Church identified the gallows of Calvary with the Pagan cross. It thus appeased Pagan Solarism. It also laid to rest the rebellious influence of Christ's work. The Shadow of Calvary ceased to menace the State-established "Christian Majesty of Civilised Power."

The Pagan Church celebrated the birth of the Old Sun God on the occasion of the winter solstice, December 25th. The Christian

Church decided to fix Christ's nativity upon this date. This was not until it was established. Christ's "birthday" was not discovered until several centuries after his death. Its discovery was a matter of diplomacy.

The Pagan Church that the Constantine-established Church had replaced observed its Lupercalia or Feasts of Pan in the month of February. These feasts dated back to the remotest antiquity. They had a frank solar origin. With the establishment of the Christian Church they were forbidden; and the Pagan conscience became uneasy. With a view to removing its uneasiness, the festival of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin was established in the sixth century. The "Christian" festival was made to synchronise with the Pagan one for purely diplomatic reasons! Its mythological justification came from Pagan sources.

The influence of Jesus survived the gallows. His spirit lived in the catacombs. It inspired the martyrs who went to the lions. The Church-Established identified his gallows with the Pagan Cross. It harmonised his name with the initials on the altar of Bacchus. It "discovered" his "birthday" to be the same as the date of the winter solstice. It made Josephus see in him a man little short of a god. It even forgot the Jesus that had lived, for a mythical Christ that dwelt in the breasts of all that were truly at one with the Church. And to complete its task, it engrafted the details of Christ's life on Pagan stories of miracles.

For centuries monks forged MSS. on the top of Mount Athos. Throughout Egypt the Church practised its pious deceit. With what energy did it resist study of the New Testament, and its publication in the vulgar tongue! How it anathematised the invention of printing! How it quailed before the scholarship of Erasmus! All in vain! Truth will out! To-day we know established Christianity to be a perpetuation of the Pagan Solarism! We understand the political basis of its persecuting antagonisms towards the Jews!

VIII.

The Davidic descent story was purely a political invention. It belongs to a period when the bishops of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria, had already come to receive the title of patriarchs and ranks of archbishops. Suggestions were already abroad of Constantine's intention to establish a patriarch of the new Imperial City of Constantinople. The prelatical government was becoming modelled, after the imperial into great prefectures, of which the four to which reference has been made were to claim superiority. A sort of feudality was being slowly, but surely, established, descending from patriarchs to metropolitans, archbishops and bishops,

some with greater, others with less extensive, spheres of dominion. Instead of the people choosing their own bishops and presbyters they are no more consulted. The presbyters are wholly dependent on the bishops and patrons; the bishops are the creatures of patriarchs and metropolitans; the sees are becoming so important that soon the Emperor himself will take over the rights of appointment. Thus Church and State are forming their first inauspicious alliance. Thus the Church—which professes to be a wife and a prude—whilst calling Jesus her spouse, her lord and master, is entering upon an adulterous connection with the State. Whilst affecting to be negligent, and not to be seeking after the emoluments of the State, like an unfaithful wife she is continually running into adulterous connection, and as studiously beguiling the unwary observer with outward professions of purity and chastity. In her old age she will claim that she has been the spring of innumerable changes in society, and has for centuries proved the greatest ethical force that has ever operated upon the history of nations, regenerating bad men and furnishing new ideals to good men, consecrating infancy, purifying youth, chastening maturity, and lending mellowness and beauty to old age. This claim has no historical foundation.

Living, as we do, at the end of the Dark Ages, we can test it in the light of experience. But were things otherwise, and did we live at the beginning of the fourth century, or even before, we should be certain of the nature of the Church's destiny. A panoramic vision of the rise and spread of Pagan-Christian ecclesiasticism would pass before our eyes. We should note how it continued to exist only by adapting itself to the prevalent opinions and customs of the periods through which it passed; how, when one form of economic and bodily slavery gave place to another, the ecclesiastical wife of the Nazarene alternately blessed and anathematised each; how, when militarism gave place to an indefinite spirit of internationalism—rendered necessary to the governing class's interests by industrial and economic evolution—this mistress of Paganism slowly replaced its former affection for militarism by a distant regard for internationalism and the holy cause of human sisterhood and brotherhood. Looking into the future, from the beginning of the fourth century, all this would seem inevitable and even natural to us. For already the ecclesiastical prostitute had exhibited herself in her true nature; already we know her to be devoid of principle and individuality, of sympathy and fidelity, of intellectual vigour and moral power. Christ, her lord and master, had warred against the Imperialism she was bent on perpetuating. This was his unpardonable offence. It meant suffering, poverty, starvation, worldly humiliation, and death in the dungeon. The Church would never forgive him for it. Besides, a carpenter was far from being a flattering companion for a mistress of so many charms. The Roman Despotism was already smiling at them, and she wished to go abroad

under its protection on the plea that it was Messianic. She wished to persuade the people that her husband had given her the right to interpret his will to the world; and that, for all practicable purposes, she exercised the functions of the Messiah at his strict bidding. So she forged title-deeds to property Christ had never laid any claims to. She wished to secure tithes by enjoining that she should be regarded as the interpreter of the Mosaic Law Christ gave her, the right to publicly impose on mankind. On this pretence she began to control public holidays. But she was obliged to lie and cheat to this end. She had to obscure the meaning of the Nazarene carpenter's antagonism to the Mosaic Ritual and dead letter of the law, whilst warning the Roman Secular Authority to be careful of opposing God's priesthood too far. Her only way was to invent the story of the Davidic Descent.

David was the second King of Israel who had been advanced to that position by Samuel, the Levite, in order to vindicate the authority of the priesthood. The Church's idea of God as "holy" was that he was powerful or mendacious. It was promulgated as a warning to those who dare to question the authority of those who claimed to speak in the name of the Lord. In this respect, the Church's conception agreed with the conception of Samuel and David. But it did not concur with Christ's. The latter's viewpoint was that of the prophets, not of the priests; of the people, not of the parasites. He meant by "a holy God" *a righteous God.* He was not concerned with power, but with freedom, with the perfect law of liberty, not with the vengeance of might. That was why Christ sneered at Moses and never said a word in praise of Samuel. That was why he had no words of veneration for David, and quoted Isaiah with approval. He was a prophet, utterly alien in thought and feeling to David and Samuel and the Church that forged her title-deeds to direct descent.

Regal government had been established among the Hebrews in the days of Samuel, the Chief Levite. Exasperated by the tyranny of priestly government, the people violently resumed the supreme magistracy out of the hands of the priest's family. Samuel cursed the people in the name of God without being able to quell the tumult. But it was agreed that the people should erect a king to govern them, Samuel undertaking to perform the functions of election agent and returning officer. He secretly decided on Saul and bamboozled the people into electing him. Saul disappointed Samuel, however, by refusing to be an agent of priestly despotism. He was a man of integrity and spirit, who believed in the secular power and had the courage to repudiate the priesthood. He was finally destroyed, with his family, for his pains; David—the traitor to Israel, licentious sycophant of the priesthood and would-be agent of Philistine success —being advanced to his place. To pretend that Christ had descended

from him, was to warn the Roman Secular Power of the danger of offending the Church, and to claim the hereditary privileges of the Jewish Priesthood by virtue of direct descent. The story of the transfiguration and the regal entry into Jerusalem were later, but attendant forgeries. Both were the calculated lies of a priestly zeal for pomp and authority. The regal entry into Jerusalem was reduced to the level of a Pagan Coronation procession. It was a hollow mockery of charlatanism. Christ was conceived of as fulfilling prophecy by deliberation — quite an authoritarian notion. It was all part and parcel of the ecclesiastical anxiety to persuade the Jewish Christians that the triumph of the Church spelt the triumph of Christ; to convince the Judean world that the Roman Despotism was established by the word of God.

IX.

The Four Gospels are really a collection of oral tradition written down many, many years—at the earliest—after the occurrence of the events they are supposed to record. The preservation of oral, as opposed to written records, was a custom that was carried over into the Christian Church from its Jewish parent. It was maintained until the fifth century, when Rabbinical literature was reduced to writing. The oral word was preserved by "catechisers." The effect of this "repetitionary" mode of historical remembrance is seen in the Gospels. The catechisers carried the oral tradition of Christianity throughout the Roman Empire. It became localised in its forms, and was then handed down as a sort of poem to be learnt off by heart and recited to others. The Synoptic Gospels really contain the three distinct localised forms of this legend that circulated throughout Judea, the Roman part of the world, and the Greek. When the writers came to write down these records they preserved the forms of oral tradition. Being mainly concerned with presenting a pen-picture of Christian doctrines in the terms of their own bigotry, superstition, and partisan feeling, they "edited" the oral tradition. Writing independently they would naturally classify events differently. But, before they came to write down the records, the "catechisers" would have modified parts of the tradition under the pressure of local ideas and prejudices. Hence there would be a dual editing. The similarity of the form of repetiton would remain. Apart, however, from the fact that Christ would often repeat his discourses at different places, the compilers of the Gospel Records would not always group the accounts chronologically, nor rightly locate the place of occurrence. Such differences would not seriously tell against the fact of Christ having said the things attributed to him. Where we decide to reject the utterances attributed to Jesus, we must base our decision on grounds other than those of

chronological discrepancy of this nature. Neither must we pursue our process of rejection on the principle that all that he said and did was of equal import, and therefore entitled to equal sanctity. We must understand the laws of psychologic growth. Such knowledge alone permits us to vision the real beauty of the life of Jesus. It offers the true index to the study of the Gospels.

Oral tradition preserved much of that divine outlook of poverty that we feel to have been a necessary concomitant of the sincerity, the spiritual enthusiasm, the single-eyedness of the man whose life it idealised. Who the Gospel writers were we cannot say. We only know that they belonged to a late period. Fragmentary records that had been reduced to writing at an earlier period have been incorporated most probably in their text. But, for the most part, all second-century records were destroyed. The Four Gospels are, unquestionably, the records of the Pagan-Christian, Constantine-established Church. That, according to St. John, occupies an unique place. The Synoptic Gospels are different. Each of these incorporates the record of Jesus's life as the early "catechisers" had impressed them upon the people's imagination. The compilers were men anxious for place and position. They accordingly sought to appease the wrath of the Roman Imperialism against the seditious impulses of Jesus by watering down his teachings. Under these circumstances, the fact that the Gospel Records contain so much calculated to irritate the feelings of Governors, proves that Christ must have conducted a bold campaign on behalf of the suffering. That campaign was still remembered by the people—it could not be wisely "forgotten"—and the compilers of the Gospel Records were obliged to record some of Christ's seditious utterances.

One thing is certain: As the Church advanced in power and position it would not seek to remember the revolutionary Jesus; it would not invent revolutionary utterances in order to place them in his mouth. No; it would seek to destroy all recollection of them as quickly as possible, even as the Social Democracy of to-day seeks to forget the revolutionary anti-Parliamentarian declarations of Marx. It would wish to invent, look up to, "remember" a respectable Christ. So that we are sure of one thing! Wheresoever Christ utters a bold, revolutionary, anti-property declamation or maxim, it is the *original Jesus* who is speaking. And an interested Church has found it as impossible to strangle his speech as it was to stifle Bruno. *Truth will out!*

We are certain of something else: The Church will make Josephus — the pharisee, anti-patriot, and flatterer of the Roman Imperialism—praise Christ in a stupid and clumsy forgery. The truth is that Josephus most likely condemned Jesus as an agitator, and the Church expunged it from his records. It will forge and lie and expunge in order to invent a respectable "Founder." It will

seek to give to all Jesus' natural heroism a miraculous, metaphysical interpretation. It will avail itself of Pagan mythology. Happy thought! It will engraft Christian worship on Pagan ceremonial! By these means it will appease the natural appetites of Pagan converts and satisfy the exigences of Christian oral tradition.

Bearing these facts in mind, we will approach the consideration of the Bible Records—i.e., the Synoptic Gospel Records. But we must make one point of reservation. No argument can be deduced in favour of the early authorship of these Gospels on the ground of certain noticeable contradictions. The idea commonly promoted by the Christian pulpit is that the Gospel Records possess a historical authenticity dating from Apostolic times. Nothing could be further from the truth. What does date back to these times are those faithful glimpses of reality that oral tradition preserved, and that the heresiarchs or early Christians, by virtue of their influence and fidelity to the human teacher, obliged the compilers of the Gospel Records to hand down to their posterity inviolate. It is no thanks to Jerome or Origen that we can go to the Gospel Records and discover the truth about Jesus of Nazareth. No thanks to those Canonical decisions recorded at Church Councils by the Pagan-Christian promoters of Pauline Christianity. But it is due to Cerdon and Carpocrates, the two famous second-century Christian scholars and orators; to Artemon, their contemporary; to the Ebonites; and last, but not least, to Paul of Samosata, who flourished in the third century. The characters of these men were blackened with "orthodox" calumny, Paul being excommunicated. Their writings were destroyed. Fragments only remain of their thought preserved in "orthodox" writings. But they accomplished their mission. They indicated the purity and rationalism of early Christian doctrines, and proved that the Christians had always inclined to the opinions we have attributed to them in our first chapter. Even the Apostles themselves were shown to have preached and embraced these ideas as the true Christian doctrines. Neither corruption nor destruction could prevent the public mind receiving the truth. Forgeries were introduced; but the oral tradition had hardened and could not be tampered with. Hence the Gospel Records with their contradictions—*valuable contradictions.*

For example: The writer-down of the Gospel Record, that describes Jesus's discussion with the wise men in the Temple, knew nothing about his "godly" nature. This discussion took place when Jesus was only twelve. Yet the writer-down of the Record says that the doctors were astonished! He makes it apparent that they recalled nothing of those circumstances of his "miraculous birth" that must have made it widely known and long remembered had it ever taken place.

From facts such as this it can be seen that it was the heresiarchs, and not the orthodox Church Fathers, who defended the truth. The

people's love for the *true* oral tradition forced the Church to record early Christian thought against its own interests and pretences to supernatural authority.

The Gospel according to Matthew incorporates the most primitive conception of Christ, since it contains the Judean legend of his life. When we shall have freed its text from the forgeries of a later period, we may expect to find in this record the least biassed report of what was really said and done by Jesus. But this Gospel is vitiated by the purpose that inspired the writer who composed it. It was unquestionably written after the Church had succeeded to the honours of the Jewish Priesthood, and is subsidiary to the Church's purpose of conquering the political power. It is written to inspire the Jewish Christians with the idea that the Church is Messianic, and that Jesus confirmed the right of the Roman Despotism to prevail. There would have been no purpose in claiming that Jesus was the Messiah of the Jews until after the Church had proceeded to lay claim to the rights of the Jewish Priesthood. The notion that he himself made such claims is contrary to early Christian teaching and the record of Christian developments. No one thought of advancing such pretences until after the second fall of Jerusalem suggested the Messianic purpose to the Christian Church. This Messianic idea, then, is no ordinary prepossession on the part of an otherwise honest writer. It is a calculated lie on the part of the Christian Church, which it has evolved out of the most Jewish and most primitive legend of Christ's life to suit its own nefarious purposes. Having invented the account of the Bethlehem birth, the compiler of Matthew transports Joseph and Mary from Bethlehem to Nazareth for no better reason than the apparent fulfilment of certain passages found in "Judges" and "Samuel" which speak of a "Nazarite," one set apart according to Jewish law. These passages have no reference to the village of Nazareth, although the compiler of Matthew quotes them to show that Jesus was the Messiah since he was a "Nazarene." The strange part about this forgery is that, in order to prove Christ was the Messiah, pious forgery insists on his parents going from Nazareth to Bethlehem in order that he might be born there; only to bring him back to Nazareth and have him called "a Nazarene." Pious ingenuity was leaving nothing to providence.

Oral tradition affirmed that Jesus vigorously rebuked those who asked for a sign, by saying that no sign should be given them except the sign of the prophet Jonah. The Roman world had no taste for reminders of righteousness. It had no love for the prophets. Accordingly, Mark's Gospel omitted the reference to Jonah. The Greek world however, preserved the true record, and makes Jesus mean that as Jonah warned Nineveh, he warned his generation. But, in reporting the remark to the Jewish world, the Church that deemed it wisdom to suppress it in Rome—not a difficult task, seeing

that Rome would not be interested in Jonah—remarked a fresh opportunity of pressing home its claim to Messiahship. So it discovers a correspondence between Christ and the Jewish type, and makes the teacher add what he could never have said: "for as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so will the son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."

The Gospel according to St. Mark is supposed by some to be earlier than either Matthew or Luke; and, by others, to be later. This peculiar classification arises from a cause that has no relation to its time of compilation. It is due merely to the fact that, whereas Matthew incorporates the Jewish, and Luke the Greek legend of Christ's life, Mark holds the balance by being the text of the Roman repetition with its forged accretions. Rome was the mistress of the Greek and Jewish worlds. Her record would not include traits that were peculiarly Jewish or even Greek. There would be a stately compromise about it, due to slight variations in the original form of the oral tradition, and, later, to the requirements of ecclesiastical forgery. We shall discover presently that this is actually the case.

The Gospel according to St. Luke incorporates the Greek legend. The Church that could establish its authority among the Jews only by theological pretensions, had to appeal to the Greek world in the terms of polemics. *Luke,* therefore, is the polemical, gentile production of an ecclesiasia that was all things to all men. It panders to the Greek jealousy of the Jews. In appealing to the Jewish world, the Church, for its own ends, had to make Christ descend from David. The Greek world was not interested in these claims. So, having made them through the compiler of Luke, Church traces Christ's descent from Adam, the father of all mankind. It also introduces Canaan blood, without any regard to Scriptural accuracy.

Matthew records how, when on one occasion Christ meets with unbelief in his own village, he says: "A prophet is not without honour but in his own country and in his own house." With Matthew this is all. It is unquestionably a fragment of the oral tradition. In Luke a manifesto against the Jews is attached on to this declaration. This stamps the Luke additions as forged. Christ's village was *not* a Jewish, but a Gentile village. Any manifesto against its inhabitants would have been not anti-Jewish, but anti-Gentile. This fact was unknown to the pious Church forger.

On the other hand, Luke omits the story of the woman of Canaan —whose daughter Jesus refused to heal — because the oral tradition never recorded it. The story appears in Matthew and Mark. It is Messianic in tone, and was invented after the Davidic genealogies.

Luke's account of how Christ sent his disciples into the Samaritan village (ix., 52) is also, most probably, a Church invention,

due to a failure to understand the record preserved in the oral tradition and incorporated in Matt. x., 5: "Go not into a way of the Gentiles, and into a city of Samaritans enter not; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." With a view to perpetuate a false interpretation of this passage, the Church expunged from Matthew's Gospel the parable of the Good Samaritan that Luke rightly records. Even as the Church could pervert Christ's charge to his disciples to his own ends in the Judean world, so it perverted his parable of the Good Samaritan in the Greek world. This remark brings us to our final record of forgery in connection with the Synoptic Records.

Zecharias had promised that the Messiah should enter the City of Jerusalem riding on the back of "an ass, *even* a colt." The expression was purely figurative. There is no fault to be found with the symbolism that but states a truth that accords with the experience of mankind. But it was discovered by a Church forger who was acquainted neither with the literal nor figurative meaning of the passage. Perhaps his acquaintance was one of gossip only. In any case, he seems to have been ignorant of the Hebrew, which he rendered "an ass and a colt."

As a prophecy, the passage in Zecharias was as applicable to Jesus as it is to later martyrs and pioneers. It expressed the grand truth that pomp never accompanied real majesty; that genius and spiritual power and real success were always attended with misery and suffering and apparent failure. By the oppressed Jews—who did not take the Pharisees and the Sanhedrin too seriously — this prophecy was embraced, most probably, as applying to Jesus. The latter may have actually ridden into Jerusalem. We cannot say. It is of no consequence in any case. Others beside Jesus rode into Jerusalem, and no one suspected they were Messiahs. The symbolism of the prophecy merely aimed at stating the lowly origin and poverty of Messiahs. And Jesus was no exception to the rule. However, the prophecy would not be applied to him outside of Judea. But as the "catechisers" would recite the Christ legend in the Roman and Greek worlds, we expect some mention of the story. And the Gospel Records do not disappoint us, as the following reference to their details attest:—

(1) MATTHEW, incorporating the legend circulated throughout the Judean world, makes Christ ride two animals in fulfilment of prophecy, and has him saluted as "Son of David" and "Jesus of Nazareth." This is somewhat contradictory and confused, but not uninteresting to the Jews.

(2) MARK, incorporating Roman world account, forgets the prophecy and the "Son of David" invention. The salutation is altered to "Blessed be the Kingdom of our Father, David."

(3) LUKE, the Greek world record, adopts Mark's account. It has no reference to prophecy, to sonship of David, or even to David's kingdom. It acclaims Christ merely as the King that cometh in the name of the Lord. Rome was not interested in the story, but could not entirely ignore Jewish prejudices. The Greek world was frankly bored. At a later period it attributed the success of the entry to the resurrection of Lazarus and Christ's miraculous powers. Outside of Judea, the Church's invention had proven still-born. The Greek world improved on it from time to time. It wanted to create an interest in it. Beside this, the Greek version of Christ's entry into Jerusalem contained an important addition not to be found in the Jewish and Roman accounts. Political persecution had led to the omission in these records of Christ's attack on Gentile votive offering. But the Greek world has seen no reason to omit it (Luke xxi., 5-6). It was less likely to create sedition in the Greek world, and was tolerated. But the Church established wished to explain this dictum of Christ away. And so the Greek world was favoured with an exclusive account of Christ's weeping over Jerusalem. "A prophecy" was put into Christ's mouth explaining the Roman overthrow of Jerusalem and attributing it to failure of the Jews to endow the "Christian Church" with their support. They did not know the time of their visitation, nor yet that the upholding of the "Christian Church" was essential to their peace! (Luke xix., 41-4). Of course not. The pious forgery expressed the truth; because the Jews knew nothing of the "Christian Church" or this forgery until after 135 A.D., when both Pagan-Christian instruments took their rise.

X.

The Fourth Gospel is of late date and freely edited. It belongs, at the earliest, to a period no nearer the time of Christ than the latter half of the second century. The main theoretical purpose of the work is to make Christ the point of union between the Hebrew personification of wisdom and the Greek conception of the logos. To this purpose it sacrifices all that is at once human and moral in the character of Christ. At the same time as it makes Christ the very embodiment of all that is arrogant and contemptible, it pretends to consecrate the spirit. It has unquestionably preserved some teachings of Christ that the synoptic gospels have not preserved. But these are easily distinguishable from the ecclesiastical creations attributed to Christ. The real purpose of this Gospel is to extend the power of the Church, in the terms of a philosophy that shall appeal to Jew and Gentile alike. Some will term it "the very apotheosis of love—God is love; Christ is love; to love is the only test, the only creed, the perfect life." But then all this "love" only

means the negation of Christ's call to righteous battle, the chloroforming of the people. And whereas the human Jesus had a noble, tender spirit, this Christ—*who embodies love*—is harsh and arrogant and bullying, except where a fragment of oral tradition peeps through the record. The truth is, the Fourth Gospel is a manufactured article. It fails to ring true. Its compiler was a lover of the miraculous and traded in perversions of the Greek philosophy. He would never let a miracle go by without incorporating it. To soothe his fanatical love of the fantastical and impossible, he invented miracles that were recorded neither in the Judean, the Roman, nor the Greek forms of the oral tradition of Christ's life. His picture of Christ's career was one of triumphant success, whereas the real career of the real Jesus had unquestionably been one of tragic failure. Yet the author of John's Gospel has no reference to Christ's baptism. He knows nothing of the heavens opening and the holy ghost descending in the form of a dove. The truth is Christ was never baptised in the Jordan. A dove never descended from heaven on to him. He never saw it. Neither did the people; for it never happened.

The author of John's Gospel, anxious to impress his readers with Christ's majestic bearing, invents a speech which he puts into the mouth of John the Baptist (vide John i., 32-34). The dramatic setting was perfect. It is founded on a possible historic situation. Christ's great prophetic contemporary perceives the power of his righteousness, and acclaims him as the living embodiment of righteousness.

Such praise is not only nice, but the sincere student of history must applaud its truth. But it is of no importance. It is neither a watchword of revolt nor yet a battle-cry. We can dispense with it to our lasting profit. Not so the Church in the days of its historic triumph. The mantle of Roman Imperialism had fallen upon it. The pomp of majesty had to be sustained; and so its forgers took this invention of John's Gospel and incorporated it into its versions of Matthew, Mark and Luke—the Jewish, Roman and Greek legends. But it improved on—because it never spiritually understood—the subtle philosophy of the Johannine text. In the interval it had decided that the holy ghost was a god, and that John the Baptist was a kinsman of Jesus, and six months his senior. Now, the object of these inventions, like the purpose of the compiler of John's Gospel in attributing the speech he does to John the Baptist, is perfectly obvious. It is to guarantee the absolute supremacy of the Church.

There is no reason to suppose that John the Baptist was a relative of Jesus. Neither could he have recognised Jesus as a teacher of righteousness. John was the great revivalist of his time, who saw in the Jewish priesthood an agent of alien domination, and the spirit of social unrighteousness. He accordingly denounced it.

He was a man of rigid ascetic virtue, a fearless denunciator of regal prostitution, a brilliant orator, a simple hero who proved his deep personal sincerity by sacrificing his life in the discharge of his duty. His memory was mourned by the people, and feared by the Roman Despotism, and its ally, the Jewish Sanhedrin. To this day his influence survives among many Eastern sects, which care little for Jesus and nothing at all for Paul, but claim John as their founder. As a matter of fact, John was an Essene, who believed in Ascetism; and who—whatever his opinions were on the subject of Jewish independence—had little sympathy with Jewish tribalism, since he adopted for all converts the symbol of purification by water which, under the old law, was used only for proselytes from alien tribes. This already implied the moral kingdom under which Jew and Gentile were included—the consequent evolution of a new cause in opposition to the Jewish priesthood — the denunciation of the Pharisees as a brood of vipers—and the union of Jew and Gentile against the Roman Despotism on the score of oppression only. With all his fanaticism, John the Baptist was seeking for the material values of true righteousness.

There can be no question that oral tradition records Jesus coming under his influence. From the time that he heard John preach, Jesus imbibed a hatred for the Pharisees and began to preach: "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." He becomes a warrior in a revolutionary cause, and thinks of demanding a personal following. But there is no suggestion of egotism. "Blessed is the womb that bare thee," cried a woman. "No," comes his retort, "blessed are they who hear the word of God and keep it." There is a suggestion of the spirit of the Essene Communist here. But was he baptised? We say, he was not. We do not believe he was ever a disciple of John. He was only an enthusiastic admirer, who grasped the power of John's message readily; but also as readily grasped the absurdities of John's asceticism. The Fourth Gospel does not mention the baptism, but it mentions the speech on which the record of the baptism was founded. It tells us of a John who understood Jesus and believed on him when no one else knew anything about him. Yet this John knew nothing of Christ's "miraculous conception" and never claimed that he belonged to the seed of David. Apparently, the compiler of this gospel record had never heard of such things. He would have laughed at these ideas.

This is important as placing the time of the Fourth Gospel, and the clumsiness of the Church forgers. It serves no further purpose, however. For the rest, it is impossible to believe that a rigorous and zealous Essene like John the Baptist would praise Jesus at their first meeting. We are thus driven to conclude that the whole story is an invention carefully fostered for ecclesiastical interests. The purpose of it will be understood when it is remembered that by its Essene wing, Judeaism was already in connection with Egypt and

some other foreign regions. Not only did the Church desire to represent itself and the Despotism it supported as a fulfilment of Christ's mission, but also of John the Baptist's. Hence the story of the baptism. Christ praised John. But the latter never praised Christ. It was easier for philosophic Jesus to pay tribute than for the ascetic enthusiast. The Church forger forgot all about this fact. However, to make the Pagan-Christian Church fulfil John the Baptist's mission, Christ was made to receive the baptism of John, and the Fourth Gospel's story of John's testimony to Christ was varied accordingly for incorporation in the texts of Matthew, Mark and Luke. *Matthew* and *Mark* were to witness how the heavens *were opened to Jesus only, and how he alone* saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove. (Vide Matt. iii., 13-17; and Mark i., 9-11.) The preposterousness of this forgery never seems to have occurred to the orthodox! Even a deity should not be credited with genius because of a self-conferred degree! Just think, the forgery suggested that Jesus was baptised before a crowd of people who never witnessed the miracle. The impression was purely subjective! It was a secret communication apparently; and could only have been revealed to an uncritical audience *by Christ himself* for the purposes of self-glorification. Ecclesiastical interests required a charlatan Saviour for its Messiah, apparently.

A later forger thought as much. But he was only in a position to tamper with the MS. of Luke's version. And so he made the whole crowd witness the transaction (Luke iii., 21-22). But the writing on the wall remains. We have traced the evolution of the forgery. The story of the baptism must be eliminated from the gospel records containing it. It must go the way of the Bethlehem birth, the Lord's supper, the genealogies, the resurrection and the ascension. These events never occurred. They belong to the category of that

> "False prophecy which dreams a lie,
> That fools believe and knaves apply."—Greene.

XI.

We cannot honestly acclaim Jesus as a Scientific Communist or Socialist, although we believe that he was a Communist and an Anarch. But he arrived at right conclusions more through the intuitive fervour of his righteousness than through a process of analysis and reason. The homage paid to his memory by the early Christians and by thinkers of later times is something more than a high poetic fact of history. It is a vindication of the mob. A select priestly crowd, the elect of political despotism, demanded his death,

instead of that of Barabbus the robber. But, left to themselves, free from priestly coercion and in face of despotism, the people's heart went out to him, and voted him their "elder brother" above all the priests and Caesars that had ever oppressed mankind.

The people's heart is always right. Despite their ignorance and prejudices, the masses are sturdy, and true, and gentle; lacking in affectation what they make up in affection, and the genius that bears witness to the truth must ever go to the people—that creature of "muddy brain" that understands the supreme heroism of truth whilst "culture" and "education" stand non-plussed with cowardice, trembling for the consequence of all fresh revelations of truth. In paying homage to the memory of Jesus, we turn our backs on kings and priests, on pomp and ceremony and cant, and salute the common people These are the sustainers of genius, the creators of wealth, the lovers of truth! Let our Atheist, Anarchist, Communist toast be given: "To Jesus and the Common People!" Comrades, the Toast!

We suspect that "Christian Socialists" will not join us in this toast. How many of them applaud the memory of Jesus for what the man really was? His very greatness destroys the argument for god. His very message was a real message of early righteousness addressed to the mortal soul of man. Man can no more believe in God and Jesus than he can in Paganism and Christianity or Pagan-Christism and Communism. Yet it is precisely Pagan-Christism, with its heathen ceremonial, that the "Christian Socialists" are concerned to perpetuate in the name of Jesus and Socialism! In the name of Jesus who did not believe in ritual! In the name of Socialism, whose materialistic philosophy enables us to explain the origin of the Church doctrines and ceremonies, and to show that their purpose was to destroy original Christian influences! To perpetuate the power of the Imperialism and the Priestcraft that crucified its "Master"! Of a truth, such "Christian Socialists" are as miserable devotees of the cause of Mammon as any other of the interested Pharisees of despotism have even been! Not the righteousness of the catacombs, but the hypocrisy of the Church Constantine established, is the keynote of all that they say and do.

There is no abuse of our present corrupt society so bad that our "Christian Socialists" have not aimed at its palliation and continuance. Prison-Reform — in order to continue the prison-system. Charity — in order to maintain philantrophy. The aim and design of every reform measure advocated by these persons is the conquest of political power by the modern leaders of the "Christian Social Democracy" in order to continue the enslavement of the people to the wages system and its principle of Empire. Yet the Anarch who died on Calvary died for the Commune, not the Empire. He died as became the pioneer who declared that: "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon!"

Had Jesus been a Socialist, would he not have said: 'Communism is the only hope of the workers! All else is illusion"? Had this great heart vibrated with life in our own time, would he not have sounded the call to the insurrectional struggle, the real battle of social revolution, where "Christian Socialists" are sounding the note of parliamentary pretence with its treachery to and attempted defeat of the revolutionary cause?

Jesus was not a Socialist. He was not even a Christian. He was only an Anarch and Rebel. But he *was* a Rebel and not a time-server. He sought reality. Consequently, he would never have masqueraded in the uniform of despotism and the cap of liberty, a political and moral clown, serving Despotism with the phrases of freedom. He was a man with message and purpose. How could he be a "Christian Socialist"?

The true rebel of our own time is a Socialist or Communist. But "Christian Socialists" are Judas Iscariots where they are not Pharisees. Their success is the success of compromise. To admire truly the Anarch of Calvary, of Gethsemane, and of the Wilderness, is beyond them.

APPENDICES.

I.—THE BETHLEHEM BIRTH.

Christians, down to the middle of the fourth century, never had any thought of a Bethlehem birth. The Jesus they believed in certainly never heard of it. Neither did those who were contemporary with him. The belief that he came from Nazareth was held unanimously. It had been preserved faithfully in the Christian communities since the time of Jesus himself by oral tradition. Everywhere and to everyone he was known as "Jesus, the son of Joseph and Mary; the prophet of Nazareth."

He was known by this description to:

(1) Simon Peter and Philip of Bethsaida, his disciples.

(2) The common people who heard him gladly.

(3) The officials who arrested him.

(4) The Jewish priestly agents who feared him.

(5) The accusers of Stephen, who flourished long after his decease.

(6) The Apostle Paul who did his best to Paganise Christianity.

In seeking to understand why the early Christians repudiated the Apostle Paul as a Pagan, the student will discover that the record of this over-rated apostle is that of a man who revelled in saying all that was exaggerated, absurd, metaphysical and miraculous about Jesus. He was the Roman and the political authoritarian. He disliked the rebellious significance of Christ's life and teachings. Indeed, he ignored all mention of Christ's teachings, his famous parables and pointed aphorisms. Often his ignorance of Christ's teachings lands him in difficulties. But whilst Paul's non-acquaintance with Christ's teachings is no argument against the historical authenticity of those sayings, his ignorance of "miraculous events" is an argument against the latter's occurrence. Paul was out of sympathy with those sayings of Jesus that constituted an eternal ethic of humanism and revolt; but he longed for suggestions of marvels. And a marvel travels much faster than a truth. On one occasion Paul was in Jerusalem whilst Christ was in Galilee. Yet the apostle makes no reference to miraculous healings. Neither has he anything to say about Christ's miraculous birth, the fury of Herod, or the slaughter of the innocents. He never heard of the Bethlehem birth, and only discovered Christ to be the last of the prophets.

The Jews conceived of the Holy Spirit as feminine. It was the the Greek philosophy that held it to be masculine. Consequently—as we have seen was actually the case—the Church could not have invented the story of Jesus's father being the Holy Spirit until after its embracement of Greek philosophy.

It would not have been any disgrace had Jesus been born out of legal wedlock. But there is no reason to assume that he was.

Morality is greater than legality. Marriage is a natural and moral state that can gain no sanctity from law, custom or convention. Jesus realised this. Had he been an illegitimate child he would not have hesitated to avow it. His enemies would have taunted him with it. But both were silent. His most orthodox opponents—the most Pharisaical of the supporters of the Roman despotism—never charged him with what respectability would sneeringly term: his mother's "misfortune." Jesus often aroused them to an abandonment of frenzy by his impeachments. They as often treated him with violence. On such occasions they showed themselves intimately acquainted with the circumstances of his parents and the facts of his career. Never a word escaped their lips about an "illegitimate" birth. No such birth ever occurred.

The parents of Jesus, his brethren, and his family history were well known in Nazareth. It was the native city of his father and mother. They never appeared to have travelled outside of it. They certainly never went up to Bethlehem to answer a census or pay any taxes. Consequently, Jesus could never have been born in Bethlehem.

The Roman rulers always farmed out taxes in the provinces, or took a lump sum from the district governors. Minute registrations of property were unknown under the Roman regime.

No census ever took place until Jesus was ten years old. This census was a novel measure, attendant on the annexation of Judea and Samaria to Syria. It was generally resented by the people on account of its vexatious novelty. But it was a census that did not affect Galilee.

II.—JESUS: HIS MENTAL GROWTH.

Moncure Conway—who passed from Unitarianism to Ethicism and Agnosticism, and wrote with such authority on the "life" of the immortal Thomas Paine—once wrote a beautiful passage on the subject of the mental growth of Jesus.

"Slight as the authentic points (of Jesus's growth) are, they are points of fire. We see him steadily emerging from sectarian trammels and national prejudices; the smoke of Jewish tradition — Gehenna, devils, angels—mingling with, but never mastering, the ever-mounting flame of his thought. . . . The hereditary conventional beliefs in his mind decrease until they linger only as superficial garb of his truth; he never makes any prevailing error his main point. . . . Especially is it interesting to note how, from basing his opposition to falsities on the written Law, he more and more appeals to nature and reason. David's eating the shew-bread and man's superiority to the Sabbath

are oddly connected for a time; but at length protest against the Sabbath is based upon unresting nature and human liberty. For his age and country, Christ was, perhaps, unique in his method of measuring usage and tradition by real principle. When he warned the youth to keep the commandments, and the young man asks **which**, he does not blindly reply—'The whole ten, of course'; he names only five from the decalogue—all the real and human ones; names none of those that protect Jehovah. For the Sabbatarian command, he substitutes 'Love thy neighbour as thyself'; instead of warning the youth against 'graven images,' which he is in no danger of worshipping, he touches his real idol — his wealth; and, instead of exhorting him to do the work of Moses' time, he calls him to the great task of his own—to come out there into the street, stand by his side, and toil for the right. How far he carried this rationalism we cannot fully know, for his words come to us with much that is irrational in his reporters; nevertheless, to the careful eye, his pearl will not be confused with the shell enclosing it. We know that it was a great soul, far above any New Testament writer, which sends us those fine protests against prayer in public places, that relegation of the heart to the closet for its mystical communion with the Highest. Not one of those believers in popular marvels who report him could have invented those exalted poetic interpretations of nature which bid us learn of the sparrow and of the lily, more glorious than Solomon in his splendour, and appealed to men to discern the signs of their own time as for the weather they watched the morning red and glow of evening. It was no believer in a fictitious providence who rebuked the notion that those on whom the tower of Siloam fell were worse than others. . . . These things represent the integrity of a great mind — the mind of a thinker, a reasoner, a poet. . . . I see plainly that there are some words and actions ascribed to Christ which are inferior to others, while they are in some cases equally authentic. But, believing that Christ was a man, I believe that he grew, and it is our duty to estimate him at his highest, and not at his lowest. . . . We are entitled, in accordance with the laws of human evolution, to claim that the judaic or superstitious utterances represent a more youthful period of his life than those which are in plain contradiction of them. Thus he says: The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all things, therefore, whatsoever they bid you, do and keep; but do ye not after their works, for they say and do not.' Now I say this is the attitude of a youth in transition —and why? Because at another time he does what those occupants of Moses' seat tell him not to do, and repudiates them on principle. They tell him to keep the Sabbath; but he—casting, no doubt, a look on over-active nature around him—replies: 'My Father ceases not his work on the Sabbath, nor do I.'

"Christ's attention was, naturally, first arrested by the corruptions with which the priesthood had invested the ancient religion. He felt the grandeur that lay in that old religion, and supposed that all it required was purification from later corruptions. It is possible that in the ardour of this early aim he might have made the violent attack on the tradesmen in the temple ascribed to him. He denounces the priests for their hypocritical evasions of the Mosaic Law. He finds them appending to the command 'Honour thy father and mother' a technical escape from its penalty, which was 'He that curses father or mother, let him die the death.' His attention not yet turned to the law itself, he attacks only their evasion:—'But ye say, Whosoever shall say to the father or the mother, Be that an offering whatsoever thou mightest have been profited by me, he need not honour his father or mother.' That is, a man might purchase an indulgence for not supporting his parents by paying a sum of money into the temple.

But it is certain Christ did not continue to believe that the established Church of his country could be so purified or expanded as to answer the needs of mankind or represent his ideal. The time came when the conviction was forced upon him that, of all that edifice not one stone should be left upon another. Not without pangs was the transition completed. Those who have known what it is to wrestle with doubts and misgivngs, who have known what it is to break the ties of love and friendship in order to follow truth and right, can best hear all the pathos of that lamentation that comes across the ages —'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killest the prophets and stoneth them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children as a hen gathers her chickens under her wings, and ye would not. Behold your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.' The next sentence is significant: 'And Jesus went out, and departed from the temple.' That was just such as a heart-broken man—abandoning finally and for ever the orthodox religion of his time—would do; as you, my friend, may have known in your pilgrimage."

These words were written in 1876. They were quoted in the text of the first edition of this pamphlet but omitted from the second (1920) edition.

III.—THE CHURCH AND WAR.

The concluding words of Chapter XI. of this work will be softened or withdrawn by the author gladly in every instance where a Church or a Minister adopts a firm stand against war and social injustice. The author is an uncompromising Atheist but he attacks the Church, not because of its opposition to Atheism, but because of its failure to uphold the Christian ethic.

In *The Word,* for March, 1940, great space is given to a letter written by Dr. Barnes, Bishop of Birmingham, to the *Manchester Guardian,* which was published by that journal on Monday, December 11, 1939.

Replying to Judge Richardson, of the Newcastle Conscientious Objectors' Tribunal, who denounced Christian pacifists as "a lot of cranks," Dr. Barnes posed a direct Christian challenge to Judge Richardson and to the militarists of Church and State in the following trenchant terms:—

"Does the Judge know that for the first two and a half centuries of its history the Christian Church was predominantly pacifist? A careful examination of this queston by a first-rate scholar is to be found in the book, 'The Early Christian Attitude to War,' published by Prof. C. J. Cadoux in 1919. If it be thought that Professor Cadoux uses the evidence mistakenly, I would refer to the 'Cambridge Ancient History,' vol. xii., 1939, page 659, where, at any rate as regards the leaders of the Church, his conclusions are accepted. Take a concrete instance. Does anyone think that Marcus Aurelius, 'the saint of

paganism,' persecuted the Christians merely because they did not worship Jupiter, Mars, Venus and the rest of the traditional gods? **The offence of the Christians was a refusal to offer incense to the genius of the Emperor or to the genius of Rome, a refusal to serve in the armies of the State, even against what at that time was literally 'the menace of German barbarism'."**

Dr. Barnes describes the attitude of the Jehovah Witnesses towards Bible inspiration and his points of critical difference. In this matter, I share the approach of the Bishop. He then emphasises the anti-militarist point of agreement:—

"We agree in our conviction that Christ forbade his followers to do wrong that good might come. We agree, therefore, that Christians ought not to serve in the Army. We agree that even to join the R.A.M.C. is to belong to an organisation forbidden to Christians. We must serve the State by our prayers and give such 'civilian' help as the Christian conscience will allow. Such was the early Christian attitude, as the perusal of a famous passage in Origen's 'Contra Celsum' (ca. A.D. 420) will demonstrate: such is the attitude of present-day Christian pacifists."

Opponents of Dr. Barnes challenged the scholarship and veracity of Professor C. J. Cadoux, to whom the Bishop had referred. Replying to these critics, Professor Cadoux pointed out that his two works, *The Early Christian Attitude to War,* and *The Early Church and The World,* aimed at being strictly historical, presenting and summarising evidence. Professor Cadoux added that the terms employed by the early Church Fathers in denouncing bloodshed excluded participation in warfare.

Professor Cadoux explained:—

"Tertullian certainly had a horror of the contamination by pagan worship to which Christians in the armies were exposed. But he also makes it perfectly clear that he had an equally strong objection to the killing. This comes out quite definitely, both in his pre-Montanist work 'De Idololatria' and in his Montanist work 'De Corona Militis.' Neither Origen nor Lactantius, in dealing with the questions of military service for Christians, even mentions the danger of idolatry: they both concentrate on the iniquity of bloodshed. Origen in particular (about A.D. 248) is concerned to reply to the complaint of the heathen philosopher Celsus, who (about A.D. 178) had criticised Christians for refusing to serve in the Imperial armies. Presumably Celsus, like Origen, knew that their objection to military service was mainly humanitarian. Yet both Celsus and Origen wrote as if refusal to serve was the general attitude of the Christians of their day."

It was asserted that Dr. Barnes' translation "Blessed are the pacifists" was a "serious misquotation" of Matthew V.9. Professor Cadoux denied that this was so. He added:—

"It is perhaps not a happy rendering, since the word 'pacifist' raises a host of modern associations; but linguistically it is the exact equivalent of the Greek word used; and, seeing that Jesus was in all essentials himself a pacifist in our sense of the term (see 'The Congregational Quarterly,' January, 1936, pages 58-67, for the evidence in detail), the bishop's translation cannot be ruled out as incorrect, in deference to 'the recorded translation.' And, in any case, what authority has a translation by virtue of the fact that it is 'recorded'?"

Writing from the Bishop's Hostel, Lincoln, the Rev. Patrick Blakiston supports the Bishop's attitude, by stating that there are other pacifists among the ante-Nicene Christian writers, besides Tertullian, Origen, and Lactantius:—

"'Thou wishest to make war,' says Tatian, 'and thou takest Apollon as thy counsellor in murder.' (xix. 849.) Apparently, to Tatian, murder and war are one and the same thing. Minucius Felix states: 'It is not right for us either to see or hear of a man being slain.' (xxx. 6.) St. Cyprian speaks of wars scattered everywhere with the bloody horror of camps.' 'The world,' he says, 'is wet with mutual bloodshed, and homicide is a crime when individuals commit it, but it is called a virtue when it is carried on publicly.' (Donat. 6.) To conclude, 'Fraud, adultery, homicide is mortal sin.' (Bon. Pat. 14.) Arnobius affirms that 'We, a numerous band of men as we are, have learned from His teaching and His laws, that evil ought not to be requited with evil, that it is better to suffer wrong than to inflict it, that we should rather shed our own blood than stain our hands and conscience with that of another.' (Adv. Gent. i. 6.)

"That these are not just the voices of individuals may be shown by the rules laid down in the Egyptian and Syrian Church Orders and in the Canons of Hippolytus, which forbid Christians to join the Army. Finally, there is Maximilianus, saint and martyr of the Catholic Church, who in the year 295 at the age of 21 laid down his life for Christ as a conscientious objector."

Against this historic statement one correspondent quoted Article 37, which insisted that war was lawful in order to combat the Anti-Militarist views of the Anabaptists.

Dr. Barnes answered very effectively by declaring that the Articles of Religion of the Church of England were not decisive against the ancient (and modern) Christian refusal of military service. He added:—

"What are the facts? In article 37, entitled 'Of the Civil Magistrates,' there appears, after a number of other statements, the assertion that 'it is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the wars.' The Elizabethan framers of the articles had a nice sense of words and were not wholly ignorant of the early history of the Christian Church. So they contented themselves with a platitude: Military service, when commanded by the State, is obviously lawful. It is not, for a Christian, lawful 'and right'."

IV.—THE MARIAN MARTYRS.

Space considerations obliged me to omit from my historical essays on Christian developments the names of many of the English Protestant Martyrs. I do not consider that the many superstitions to which they subscribed in life justifies their names being remembered. Their magnificent negation of other superstitions, their splendid challenge to priestcraft and to authority, their brave defence of conscience and of the right of private judgement, rank them as immortals. At the present time of struggle for conscience their names should be saluted. Mostly simple, unlearned people, they towered above the princes of church and state in their defence of truth and their stand for human freedom. We owe our greater liberties to their witnessing, and one day, will owe to them the commonwealth of human well-being.

The following list is set out in chronological order.

The designation "priest" means priest of the Church of England, that refused to recognise the Papal Authority, as distinct from the Church of England that recognised the Papal Authority.

Where names are bracketed together, it means that the martyrs were burned at the one fire.

The martyrs were burned in every case, except where I place an asterisk against the name.

In those cases they died in prison. The five persons who died in Canterbury Castle, November, 1556, were famished to death. In other cases they died of jail-fever but were not deliberately starved to death.

This list is a complete record of the persons who were martyred under Mary I., during the years 1555-1558.

In another place, I shall list Quaker and Unitarian Martyrs, including the great and heroic scholar, the immortal Servetus.

A.D. 1555.

John Rogers, priest	Smithfield	Feb. 4.
Laurence Saunders, priest	Coventry	Feb. 8.
Dr. John Hooper, bishop	Gloucester	Feb. 9.
Dr. Rowland Taylor, priest	Aldham Common	Feb. 9.
Thomas Tomkins, weaver	Smithfield	March 16.
Thomas Higbed, gentleman	Horndon-on-Hill	March 26.
Thomas Causton, gentleman	Raleigh, Essex	March 26.
William Hunter, apprentice	Brentwood	March 27.
William Pygot, butcher	Braintree	March 28.
Stephen Knight, barber	Maldon	March 28.
J. Laurence, priest	Colchester	March 29.
Dr. R. Farrar, bishop	Carmarthen	March 30.
Rawlins White, fisherman	Cardiff	March
George Marsh, priest	Chester	April 24.
William Flower, monk	Westminster	April 24.
John Simson, husbandman	Rochford	May 25.

John Ardeley, husbandman	Raleigh	May 25.
John Cardmaker, prebendary	Smithfield	May 30.
John Warne, upholsterer	Smithfield	May 30.
Thomas Haukes, gentleman	Coxhall	June 10.
Thomas Wats, draper	Chelmsford	June.
N. Chamberlain, weaver	Colchester	June 14.
Thomas Osmond, fuller	Manningtree	June 15.
William Bamford, weaver	Harwich	June 15.
John Bradford, priest	Smithfield	July.
John Leaf, apprentice	Smithfield	July.
*William Minge	Maidstone	July.
John Bland, priest John Frankesh, vicar Nicholas Shetterden Humphrey Middleton	Canterbury	July 12.
N. Hall, bricklayer	Rochester	July 19.
Christopher Waid, weaver	Dartford	July 19.
Dirick Carver, brewer	Lewes	July 22.
John Launder, husbandman	Steyning	July 23.
Elizabeth Warne, widow	Stratford	July.
Thomas Iveson, carpenter	Chichester	July.
Margery Polley	Rochester	July.
*John Aleworth	Reading	July.
James Abbes	Bury	Aug. 2.
Thomas Denley, gentleman	Uxbridge	Aug. 8.
Robert Smith, gentleman	Uxbridge	Aug. 8.
George Tankerfield, cook	St. Albans	Aug. 26.
Patrick Packingham	Uxbridge	Aug. 28.
Stephen Harwood	Stratford	Aug.
Thomas Fust	Ware	Aug.
William Hale	Barnet	Aug.
*George King	London	Aug.
*Thomas Leyes	London	Aug.
*John Wade	London	Aug.
*William Andrew, carpenter	Newgate	Aug.
Robert Samuel, priest	Ipswich	Aug. 31.
John Newman, pewterer	Saffron Walden	Aug. 31.
Richard Hook	Chichester	Aug. 31.
William Coker Henry Laurence Richard Wright William Hopper Richard Collier William Store	Canterbury	Aug.
William Allen, labourer	Walsingham	Sept.
Roger Cox	Yoxford	Sept.
Thomas Cob, butcher	Thetford	Sept.
George Catmer Robert Streater Anthony Burward George Bradbridge James Tutty	Canterbury	Sept. 6.
Thomas Hayward John Gareway	Lichfield	Sept.
Robert Glover, gentleman	Coventry	Sept. 20.
Cornelius Bungey	Coventry	Sept. 20.
William Wolsey, constable	Ely	October
Robert Pygot, painter	Ely	October
Dr. Nicholas Ridley, bishop	Oxford	October 16.
Dr. Hugh Latimer, bishop	Oxford	October 16.

George Roper, gentleman	Canterbury	October.
John Webb, gentleman		
Gregory Parke, gentleman		
*William Wiseman, cloth-worker	Lollards' Tower	Dec. 13.
*James Gore	Colchester	Dec.
John Philpot, archdeacon	Smithfield	Dec. 18.

A.D. 1556.

Thomas Whittle, priest	Smithfield	January 27.
Bartlet Green, gentleman		
John Tudson, artificer		
John Went, artificer		
Thomas Browne		
Isabel Foster		
Joan Warne		
John Lomas	Canterbury	January 31.
Anne Allbright		
Joan Catmer		
Agnes Smith		
Joan Sole		
Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury	Oxford	March 21.
Agnes Potten	Ipswich	March 23.
Joan Trunchfield		
John Maundrall, farmer	Salisbury	March.
William Coberley, tailor		
John Spicer, mason		
John Hullier, minister	Cambridge	April 2.
Robert Drakes, minister	Smithfield	April 23.
William Tyms, curate		
Richard Spurge, sheerman		
Thomas Spurge, fuller		
John Cavel, weaver		
George Ambrose, fuller		
Joan Beach	Rochester	April.
John Harpole		
Christopher Lyster, husbandman	Colchester	April 28.
John Mace, apothecary		
John Spencer, weaver		
Simon Joyne, sawyer		
Richard Nichols, weaver		
John Hammond, tanner		
Thomas Drowry, a blind boy	Gloucester	May 5.
Thomas Croker, bricklayer		
Hugh Laverock, a cripple	Stratford-le-Bow	May 15.
John Aprice, blind		
Katherine Hut, widow	Smithfield	May 16.
Joan Horns		
Elizabeth Thackvel		
*Margaret Ellis	Newgate	May.
Thomas Spicer, labourer	Beccles	May 21.
John Denny, labourer		
Edmund Poole, labourer		
Thomas Harland, carpenter	Lewes	June 6.
John Oswald, husbandman		
Thomas Avington, turner		
Thomas Read, labourer		
Thomas Wood, minister	Lewes	June 20.
Thomas Mills		
*William Alderhall, priest	King's Bench	June 24.
*John Clement, wheelwright	King's Bench	June 24.
Thomas Moor, a merchant's servant	Leicester	June 26.

Henry Adlington, sawyer Laurence Parman, smith Henry Wye, brewer William Hallywel, smith George Searles, tailor	Stratford	June 27.
Edmund Hurst, labourer Lyon Cawch, broker Ralph Jackson, servant John Derifall, labourer John Routh, labourer Elizabeth Pepper Agnes George	Stratford	June 27.
*Thomas Parret	Southwark	June.
*Martin Hunt	Southwark	June.
*John Norice	Southwark	June.
Robert Bernard, labourer Adam Foster, husbandman Robert Lawson, weaver	Bury, Suffolk	June.
*John Fortune, blacksmith	Norwich	June.
*John Careless, weaver	King's Bench	July 1.
Julius Palmer, scholar John Gwim Thomas Askim	Newbury	July 16.
Catherine Cawches Guillemme Gilbert Perotine Massey	Guernsey	July 18.
Thomas Dungate John Foreman Mother Tree, widow	Grinstead, Sussex	July 18.
Joan Waste, blind girl	Derby	August 1.
Edward Sharp	Bristol	Sept. 8.
John Hart, shoemaker	Bristol	Sept. 8.
Thomas Revansdale, currier	Mayfield	Sept. 24.
A Carpenter	Bristol	Sept. 25.
John Horn A Woman	Wooton - under - Edge	Sept. 27.
A Shoemaker	Northampton	October
—Hooke	Chester	October.
*Three Persons (unnamed)	Chichester	October.
*John Clark	Canterbury Castle	Nov.
*Duston Chittenden	Canterbury Castle	Nov.
*William Foster	Canterbury Castle	Nov.
*Alice Potkins	Canterbury Castle	Nov.
*John Archer, weaver	Canterbury Castle	Nov.

A.D. 1557.

Stephen Kempe William Waterer William Prowting W. Lowick Thomas Hudson William Hay	Canterbury	January 15.
N. Final M. Bradbridge	Ashford	January 16.
T. Stephens J. Philpot	Wye	January.
Thomas Loseby Henry Ramsey Thomas Thirtell Margaret Hale Agnes Stanley	Smithfield	April 12.

William Morant	Southwark	May.
Stephen Gratwick		
— King		
John Bradbridge	Maidstone	June 18.
Walter Appleby		
Petronil Appleby (his wife)		
Edmund Allin, miller		
Catherine Allin (his wife)		
John Manning's wife		
Elizabeth, a blind girl	Maidstone	June 18.
John Fishcock	Canterbury	June 30.
Nicholas White		
Nicholas Pardue		
Barbara Final, widow		
Bradbridge's widow		
Wilson's wife		
Benden's wife		
Matthew Plaise		(date unknown).
Richard Woodman, ironmonger	Lewes	June 22.
George Stevens		
William Mainard		
Alex. Hosman, servant		
Thomasine Wood		
James Morris		
Denis Burgis		
Ashdon's wife		
Grove's wife		
*— Ambrose	Maidstone gaol	June.
*R. Lush	Bath prison	June
Simon Miller	Norwich	July 13.
Elizabeth Cooper		
William Munt	Colchester	August 2.
Alice Munt		
Rose Allin		
*John Thurston	Colchester Castle	August 2.
John Johnson	Colchester	August 2.
William Bongeor		
Thomas Benold		
William Purcas		
Agnes Silverside		
Helen Ewring		
Elizabeth Folkes		
John Kurde, shoemaker	Northampton	August.
George Eagles, tailor	Chelmsford	August.
Richard Crashfield	Norwich	August.
— Fryer	Norwich	August.
A sister of George Eagles	Rochester	August.
Mrs. Joyce Lewes	Lichfield	August.
Ralph Allerton	Islington	Sept. 17.
James Austoo		
Margery Austoo		
Richard Roth		
Agnes Bongeor	Colchester	Sept. 17.
Margaret Thurston		
John Noyes, shoemaker....	Laxfield	Sept. 22.
Cicely Ormes	Norwich	Sept. 23.
John Foreman....	Chichester	October.
John Warner		
Christian Graver		
Thomas Athoth		
Thomas Avington		
Dennis Burgis		

Thomas Ravensdale	Chichester	October.
John Milles		
Nicholas Holden		
John Hart		
Anne Fry		
John Oseward		
Thomas Harland		
James Moris		
Thomas Dougate		
John Ashedon		
Thomas Spurdance	Bury	Nov.
John Hallingdale	Smithfield	Nov. 18.
William Sparrow		
Richard Gibson		
John Rough, priest	Smithfield	Dec. 22.
Margaret Mearing		
A.D. 1558.		
Cuthbert Symson, deacon	Smithfield	March 28.
Hugh Foxe		
John Devenish		
William Nichol	Wales	April 9.
William Seaman	Norwich	May 19.
Thomas Carman		
Thomas Hudson		
William Harris, Richard Day, Christian George	Colchester	May.
Henry Pond	Smithfield	May.
Rainol Eastland		
Robert Southam		
Matthew Ricarby		
John Floyd		
John Holliday		
Roger Holland		
Robert Mills	Brentford	July 14.
Stephen Cotton		
Robert Dynes		
Stephen Wright		
John Slade		
William Pikes		
Richard Yeoman, curate	Norwich	July 14.
*John Dale, weaver	Bury gaol	July.
*John Alcock, sheerman	Newgate	July.
Thomas Benbridge, gentleman	Smithfield	July.
John Cooke, sawyer	Bury St. Edmunds	August.
Robert Miles, sheerman		
Alexander Lane, wheelwright		
James Ashley, bachelor		
Alexander Gouch, Alice Driver	Ipswich	Nov. 4.
Philip Humfrey, John David, Henry David	Bury	Nov.
Mrs. Prest	Exeter	Nov.
John Corneford, Christopher Browne, John Herst, Alice Snoth, Catherine Tynley	Canterbury	Nov. 10.

These men and women witnessed bravely and simply against tyranny. Let no man or woman henceforth be afraid to suffer that humanity might overcome tyranny.

AUTHOR'S NOTE

"SOCIALISM AND THE POPE": ERRATUM.

A curious author's error occurs in No. 1 of *"The Word" Library*. On page 4, I attribute a certain passage to Archbishop Maguire of Glasgow. On page 64, I attribute the same passage to Cardinal Manning. The second citation is correct. Cardinal Manning is the author of the quotation; beginning *"It seems almost incredible,"* and ending *"the lives of the unfortunate."* The error arose from my carelessness in page-making.

The passage I intended to quote from Archbishop Maguire reads as follows:—

> "What did Capital risk? Its money. What did Labour risk? Its life. Go into the mines of Lanarkshire and the shipyards of Glasgow. It risked its life. In the same way, how differently had the poor man been treated from the man in high position who had been inefficient. He became useless and, not through his own fault, was cast aside. How many inefficient men of high position were buried in Westminster Abbey? When they had an inefficient Cabinet Minister they sent him to the House of Lords. When they had an inefficient 'gentleman' they gave him a handsome pension, and then when they had an inefficient workingman they sent him to the workhouse."

As the reader will see, this follows on naturally from the reference made to Archbishop Maguire above the quotation.

My apology for gross carelessness.

Author's Appeal

TO EDITORS, READERS AND LIBRARIANS.

[It was the author's intention to collect his pamphlets and publish them in one volume. The war may make this impossible. But each pamphlet in **The Word Library** will be sent round as suggested. So the appeal stands, applied to the entire series. Collection in one volume is postponed.]

This collection of essays will be sent to a number of papers in all parts of the world for review. It will be sent specially to the press in Britain, America, the American Colonies, and the British Dominions. Editors are asked, as a favour, to send copies of their papers containing review notices to the author.

The volume will be sent, also, to the chief public libraries in Britain and the United States. It will be sent post free to any public library in the world on the receipt of an application from the librarian. Readers are reminded that the first editions of each of the pamphlets, revised and collected in this volume, can be consulted in the British Museum. Some of them are to be found in the Public Library at New York.

Readers are asked to purchase several copies of the work and to circulate the copies among their friends. Order small quantities at reduced rates. The struggle for bread and freedom, for culture and liberty as well as security, must be revived and rewaged. If the reader belongs to some organisation that conducts meetings, he should arrange for the author to visit his town, and to be afforded a free platform from which to define his position. The author may be wrong on a thousand points, but the revival of thought and discussion must be right. The Glasgow Clarion Society did this in 1912. Why not your organisation to-day?

The widespread circulation of this work, apart from its cost of printing, will be an expensive business. It will be followed by other books that will be circulated in the same way. If the reader has enjoyed reading *Essays in Revolt,* and if he can assist in the cost of popularising the book, he or she should do so. The author welcomes donations in the struggle and the money so received will be used in the public interest and to further the cause of thought and freedom to which he has dedicated his energies. A thousand people, helping from a thousand quarters, are an organisation of strength and energy for progress, the force of which cannot be estimated. Help now.

Also, if you are critical, send along your criticisms. If you see a notice of this book, friendly or unfriendly, send it along.

Whatever your communication, address it to the author at his private address: GUY ALDRED, 5 BALIOL STREET, GLASGOW, C.3., SCOTLAND.

Personal and Incidental

Author's Other Works Include:

SOCIALISM AND PARLIAMENT.—Part I.—Socialism or Parliament. 1934. Rewritten and Revised Edition. Out of Print. Shortly to be reprinted. 16 chapters and 8 appendices.

SOCIALISM AND PARLIAMENT.—Part II.—Government by Labour. 3rd Edition. Rewritten and Revised. Shortly to be published.

FOR COMMUNISM. (1935.) 21 chapters and 12 appendices. Shortly to be reprinted, with slight revisions and corrections.

These booklets will be issued in popular form, for wide circulation, at absurdly cheap prices, to stimulate purchase and study.

WHY JESUS WEPT. A series of historical essays.

BAKUNIN. The life story of the great agitator. With his collected writings.

RICHARD CARLILE, AGITATOR. Enlarged, to include selections from Carlile's writings.

These books will be issued rapidly from the Press—in slightly less popular form than the works previously mentioned, because they belong to study rather than to ordinary propaganda. The interest in these writings will be special rather than general.

AT GRIPS WITH WAR. First Edition, 1929. Second Edition, 1932. This work will be re-issued at an early date.

"THE WORD" LIBRARY

Pamphlets by

GUY A. ALDRED

1. SOCIALISM AND THE POPE.
2. THE REBEL—OR HIS DISCIPLES?
3. JOHN MACLEAN: MARTYR OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE.
4. TO THE EDITOR: 30 Years' Correspondence on Subjects of Varying Interest.
5. HISTORICAL AND TRADITIONAL CHRISTIANITY.
6. STUDIES IN COMMUNISM.
7. PIONEERS OF ANTI-PARLIAMENTARISM.
8. DOGMAS DISCARDED — Part I.
   (Stages of Thought: 1886-1908.)

Other Pamphlets are being prepared and other Reprints issued. This will bring the Author's writings up to date and restore to circulation essays too long out of print.

YOU SHOULD READ...

"THE WORD"

A monthly journal devoted to Anti-Militarism and the cause of the Conscientious Objector.

To rouse the people, to combat war, and to speed commonweal.

Obtainable from:

The Strickland Press and the Bakunin Press.
On sale at all U.S.M. meetings.

Single copies, 2d.; postage ½d. Annual Sub., 2s. 6d

All comrades interested in *THE WORD* and the pamphlets now being published, are invited to join the United Socialist Movement. Group meetings are held every Monday, at 8 p.m., at Bakunin Hall, 29 Castle Street, Glasgow, C.4

KIRKWOOD
(PRINTERS) LTD.
152 CLYDE ST., GLASGOW